TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY
3 1761 04827 8865

FROM THE LIBRARY OF
TRINITY COLLEGE
TORONTO

Herbert T. Archbold.

AN INTRODUCTION

TO

THE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

AN INTRODUCTION

TO

THE ARTICLES OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

BY

THE REV. G. F. MACLEAR D.D.

WARDEN OF S. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE CANTERBURY
AND HONORARY CANON OF CANTERBURY
AUTHOR OF AN "INTRODUCTION TO THE CREEDS"
"THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST" ETC. ETC. ETC.

AND

THE REV. W. W. WILLIAMS M.A.

FORMERLY VICE-PRINCIPAL OF THE MISSIONARY COLLEGE, DORCHESTER,
FELLOW OF S. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE CANTERBURY

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN CO.
1896

[*All rights reserved.*]

Ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαινόντων λόγων.

S. Paulus, 2 *Ep. ad Timotheum*, i. 13.

First Edition 1895.
Reprinted with corrections 1896.

TO

THE REVEREND CANON BAILEY, D.D.

FORMERLY FELLOW OF S. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE

AND FOR MANY YEARS

WARDEN OF S. AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE, CANTERBURY

THIS VOLUME

IS DEDICATED WITH SINCERE RESPECT AND AFFECTION

BY HIS FRIEND

THE PRESENT WARDEN

"One Canon reduced to writing by God Himself, two Testaments, three Creeds, four General Councils, five centuries, and the series of Fathers in that period—the three centuries, that is, before Constantine, and two after, determine the boundary of our faith."

Bp Andrewes, *Opusc. Posthuma*, p. 91.

117080

MAR 18 1999

PREFACE.

THIS Volume which forms one of Messrs Macmillan's well-known Theological Manuals has been for some time in preparation and at length is in the reader's hands. The wide circulation, which has been attained by other Volumes in the series, encourages the hope that like them it will be found to supply a want.

The present Treatise forms an Introduction to the Articles of the Church of England. I have used the term "Introduction" designedly. The Volume is not intended in any degree to enter into competition with such works on the same subject as those of Bishop Burnet, Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Browne, or Bishop Forbes. It contains numerous references to their works and to others of more recent authority, and the notes and illustrations, with which it is supplied, are intended to guide the student to the Authors, who have written more largely on the different topics which again and again challenge discussion.

The great object I have kept in view has been to secure as much clearness and distinctness of statement as possible, and by dividing the text into consecutive paragraphs, to emphasize the chief points which call for the student's attention in grasping the meaning and interpretation of the Articles. Hence also I have constantly endeavoured to trace the connection of the several Articles; to indicate their source, object, and aim in the light of the great movements which called them forth; and then to illustrate

and explain by reference to Holy Scripture and Patristic writers the statements they contain, and to support these, where necessary, by reference to other symbolical writings of the Anglican Church, her Prayer-Book, Ordinal, Homilies, and Canons.

In the interpretation of the Articles I have striven always to give due weight to their plain and grammatical sense, as they were understood by the divines of the period of Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth, and wherever the language of the Articles themselves has been doubtful or obscure, to remember the recommendation of the Canon of 1571 laid down in the same Convocation that required subscription to the Articles, to put forth only "that, which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and that which the Catholic doctors and ancient Bishops have collected out of the same doctrine." "The Church of England," writes Bishop Bull, "professeth not to deliver all her Articles as essentials of faith without the belief whereof no man can be saved; but only propounds them as a body of safe and pious principles, for the preservation of peace to be subscribed, and not openly contradicted by her sons[1]." "We do not hold our Thirty-nine Articles," says Archbishop Bramhall, "to be such necessary truths, '*extra quam non est salus*,' 'without which there is no salvation'; nor enjoin ecclesiastic persons to swear unto them, but only to subscribe them, as theological truths, for the preservation of unity among us, and the extirpation of some growing errors[2]." Made originally as comprehensive as possible[3] they are

[1] Bishop Bull, *A Vindication of the Church of England*, xxvii. *Works*, Vol. II. p. 211. Oxford, 1846.

[2] See Archbp Bramhall, *Works*, Vol. II. p. 201; also p. 476, Oxford, 1842; see also Keble, *Catholic Subscription to the xxxix Articles*, p. 13.

[3] See Dixon, *History of the Church in England*, Vol. III. pp. 520—527.

to be regarded as Articles of Peace intended to include and not exclude different schools of thought.

In compiling this Introduction to the Articles I have had the advantage of the advice and co-operation of my friend and colleague the Rev. W. W. Williams, Fellow of S. Augustine's College. He has carefully gone over the sheets and made many suggestions, which his extensive Patristic reading has made very valuable. I must also acknowledge with my best thanks the kindness of Messrs G. Bell and Co., for allowing me to make use of Appendix iii. to Archdeacon Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, and to place side by side the Latin Articles of 1563 and the English Articles of 1571. Nor must I forget the help I have received from one of our Augustinian Students, Mr P. R. L. Fisher, who has verified for me many of the references in the text and the notes, and last but not least from the staff of the Cambridge University Press for not a few valuable hints and suggestions, while the work was passing under their hands.

If this Introduction shall in any degree serve as a help to Theological Students in their study of the Articles, my labours will have been amply rewarded, and I shall feel I have attained the object at which I have aimed[1].

G. F. M.

S. Augustine's College,
S. Peter's Day, 1895.

[1] For several points connected with the first Five Articles the Student will do well to consult the "Introduction to the Creeds."

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE fact that a second Edition of this "Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles" has been called for within less than twelve months seems to show that at least in some measure it serves the purpose for which it was intended.

The task of preparing this Edition has fallen to a great extent on my friend and colleague Mr Williams, who rendered such signal service in the preparation of the first. In the present Edition he has incorporated the results of friendly criticisms which have reached us from various quarters, and in the additional notes at the end of the volume has supplied from his own wide reading and careful investigation much that will help to illustrate several points, which of necessity have been but briefly noticed in the body of the book.

We both desire to express our obligations to several friends for their kindly communications, and especially to the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, who has evinced a very welcome interest in the volume, and has offered not a few valuable suggestions, of which we have been glad to avail ourselves.

G. F. M.

ST AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE, CANTERBURY,
Easter Term, 1896.

SYNOPSIS OF CONTENTS.

I.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

PAGES

Origin and History of the Thirty-nine Articles . . 1—22

II.

THE ARTICLES.

GROUP I. ARTICLES I—V.

The Teaching of the Church concerning the Three Persons in the Trinity . . . . . 23—93

III.

THE ARTICLES.

GROUP II. ARTICLES VI—VIII.

The Church's Rule of Faith . . . . . 95—138

IV.

THE ARTICLES.

GROUP III. ARTICLES IX—XVIII.

The Teaching of the Church respecting Christians as individuals . . . . . 139—234

V.

THE ARTICLES.

GROUP IV. ARTICLES XIX—XXXIV.

PAGES

The Teaching of the Church respecting Christians as members of a religious Society . . . . . 235—388

VI.

THE ARTICLES.

GROUP V. ARTICLES XXXV—XXXIX.

The Teaching of the Church respecting certain special points affecting the national Church and Realm of England . 389—429

VII.

APPENDIX.

I. The Lambeth Articles . . . . . 430—433
II. Additional Notes . . . . . 434—440
III. Chronological Tables . . . . . 441—443
IV. General Index . . . . . 444—451
V. Index of Greek words explained in the Notes . . 452—453
VI. Index of Latin words explained in the Notes . . 453—454
VII. Index of English words explained in the Notes . 454

VIII.

MAPS.

THE REVOLT FROM ROME.
THE UNIVERSITIES OF EUROPE IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

Origin of the Articles.

i. **The Articles of the Church of England** are a distinct product of the Sixteenth Century. They were drawn up amidst the mighty controversies, which convulsed the Church at the time of the Reformation. The original object, therefore, of the compilers will be best ascertained by remembering the peculiarities of the crisis which led to their promulgation[1].

ii. **The Need** of some Reformation had long before the Sixteenth Century been felt in well-nigh every province of the Western Church. The abuses, which had pervaded the whole system of the Church, had been pressed on the attention of successive Popes, Kings, Parliaments, Councils, and Diets[2]. Select committees of Cardinals, like that

[1] Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 1.

[2] Comp. Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 371, n. 3. At the Council of Pisa A.D. 1409 "the prelates and proctors of England, France, Germany, Poland, Bohemia, and Provence presented to the Pope a list of grievances to which they called his attention, as deviating from the old laws and customs of the Church. They enumerate translations of bishops against their will, Papal reservations and provisions, destruction of the rights of patronage of bishops and chapters, the exaction of firstfruits and tenths, grants of exemption from the visitatorial power of bishops, the excessive liberty of appeal to the Pope in cases which had not been heard in the inferior courts." Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, i. p. 221; for the same desire of reform at the council of Constance 1414 see Ibid. p. 261.

appointed by Pope Paul III. in 1538, for the reform of the Church, only touched the surface of scandals, against which the disciples of Wiclif in England, of Huss and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia, had protested in vain. Even the Popes themselves, if they had been religious and willing, might have reformed the Church. But they took no effectual steps in the right direction[1], and the sale of Indulgences under Pope Leo X. precipitated the revolt of the Teutonic Churches from the Roman centre[2].

iii. **The Guiding Principle** of the Church of England in the Sixteenth Century was not any wish to found a new Church or a novel system of her own, but to return to the old paths[3]; not to make a new, but to bring back the old national Church; not to break away from the rest of Christendom, but only to extinguish the unlawful jurisdiction of a proud and bold usurper[4], and by following in

[1] Two plans seemed possible for conducting a Reformation; "the one involving the cooperation of the Pope and hierarchy, and through them extending to the whole of Western Christendom; the other starting from the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of each particular state or nation and removing the abuses which especially affected it." Hardwick, *Hist. Reform.* p. 3.

[2] The great attempt, which found expression in the councils of Pisa (1409), Constance (1414), Basel (1431), and culminated in the council of Trent (1542—1563) was only in part due to the Papacy. It is doubtful whether, but for the efforts of the Emperor, the Universities, and the Nations, it would ever have been made, and it is most naturally associated with such names as those of the Gallicans D'Ailly and Gerson. Caraffa, who afterwards became Pope Paul IV., was a devout man and a great reformer of abuses, but in the words of a distinguished Roman Catholic writer of to-day, speaking of "the nine Popes who successively followed Nicholas V. (d. 1455)," "it is not too much to say that under such Pontiffs moral scepticism must have radiated from those who sat in the Apostolic Chair." Lilly's *Claims of Christianity*, p. 162, Ed. 1894.

[3] "The Reformation fell back upon the ancient Creeds in their integrity. For the most part, those symbols were laid as the foundations of the new superstructure, and were assumed into its formularies; thus establishing at the very outset a broad basis of connection and unity with the faith as delivered by the Apostles to the Church, and by the learning, zeal, and fidelity of the Church expressed in these primitive standards." Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, Introd. p. xiii.

[4] For the (1) religious, (2) political, and (3) social causes of the Reformation see Creighton's *History of the Papacy*, i. pp. 261 sqq.; Perry's *Reformation*, pp. 2—6.

the footsteps of the Primitive Church, to eliminate the distinctively Roman but not Catholic element which had intruded itself into her[1].

iv. **The Revolt** of England from Rome differed from the revolt on the Continent. In Germany and Switzerland a religious movement preceded and caused a political change. In England the political change came first, and the religious change afterwards, and in these islands the nation, being compact and having a strong central government, instead of splitting into parties and being distracted by civil war, revolted altogether[2]. The King and Parliament acted in unison, and their action in transferring to the crown the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, hitherto exercised by the Pope, was endorsed by Convocation, by the Universities, and by the Cathedral bodies.

v. **The Change** effected was very gradual in this country. For a time all went on as before. People repaired to the same Churches, used the same prayers, and conformed to the same customs as in times past, only there was no longer any recognition of the supremacy of the Pope[3]. Henry VIII. clung firmly to the old mediæval doctrines[4], and though the Latin Service Books were

[1] "Reformatio non aurum abstulit, sed purgavit a luto: non vel fundamenta evertit vel parietes diruit aut tecta, sed vepres solum exscidit, et fimum ejecit: non carnem, ossa, aut sanguinem corpori detraxit, sed saniem et humores pestiferos expulit...De substantia antiquæ et Catholicæ fidei nihil quidquam a nobis immutatum; quidquid tale est ambabus ulnis, exosculamur, tuemur." Crackanthorp, *Defensio Eccl. Anglicanæ*, p. 601, Ed. Wordsworth, 1847.

[2] Seebohm's *Protestant Revolution*, p. 167.

[3] "It was the Church, not of Rome, but of England (*Ecclesia Anglicana*), of which the rights and liberties were declared inviolable by King John's Great Charter, confirmed by Henry the Third. It is the Holy Church of England (*Seinte Eglise d'Engleterre*), which, in the preamble to the Statute of Provisors of 23 Edward III. (A.D. 1350), was described "as founded in the estate of Prelacy, within the realm of England." The Papal encroachments which the Statute was passed to restrain, were described as tending to 'the annullation of the Estate of the Holy Church of England'." Earl Selborne's *Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment*, pp. 9, 10, 3rd ed.

[4] The Reformation was but the continuation and development of a

revised, and the Litany was put forth in English for public use, there was little progress in any doctrinal Reformation. The translation, however, of the Holy Scriptures, and their circulation during this monarch's reign, accompanied as they were by the general revival of learning, while they gave a great impetus to the new movement, stirred no little controversy and speculation in men's minds, accustomed as they had long been to turn for guidance to the decrees of the Roman See.

vi. **The Danger.** It was impossible, however, that so great a change in the attitude of the English Church towards the Roman See could be unattended with danger. For various conflicting opinions were at once put forth on matters of faith and doctrine, and every man challenged to himself the right of private judgment, and many not only abused it, but indulged too often in wild speculation and unauthorized practices. It was the natural wish, therefore, of several leaders in the new movement, both on the Continent and in this country, that formal "Confessions" or "Articles of Faith" should be drawn up, which should put an end to these mischievous divisions, exhibit the actual

struggle which had long been going on in this country, and the reassertion of the independence of the English National Church, an independence which had never been lost sight of since the days of the British Church, and indeed from the very commencement of the history of the Church in these islands. Before the Norman Conquest the English Church had yielded but a partial assent to the Pope's claim to be autocrat over all the Churches, and though the Norman dynasty fell in with the prevailing tone of subjection to Roman claims, William I. contended stoutly for his own ecclesiastical supremacy, and refused to do homage to the Pope for the realm of England, or to allow Papal Bulls to run in his kingdom. See Stubbs' *Constitutional History*, i. pp. 281, 285; Lord Selborne's *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 15. Henry II. by the Constitutions of Clarendon, A.D. 1164, strongly asserted the rights of the National Church of England. "King John in the first Article of Magna Charta declared that the Church of England should be free, and enjoy its whole rights and licenses inviolable. During the reign of Edward III. and Richard II. no less than six Acts of Parliament declared the interference of the Pope with the temporalities of the English Church to be illegal." See Lord Selborne's *Defence*, pp. 28—31; Aubrey Moore's *History of the Reformation*, pp. 35, 40.

tenets of those who had separated themselves from the Roman centre, and in some measure define their dogmatical position, as Rome herself did more exhaustively afterwards at the Council of Trent[1].

[1] "We did not at the Reformation start our career in separation from Rome by drawing up a formulated constitution, as did the American leaders at the Declaration of Independence. Our Articles do not treat exhaustively the whole field of Theology; they impose limits in some directions and define principles in others, but cannot be regarded as dealing in full with all the functions of the English Church." *The Anglican Position*, Article in "The Guardian," Jan. 10, 1894.

CHAPTER II.

The Augsburg Confession.

i. **The Schwabach Articles.** One of the earliest occasions when the idea of presenting a defence of their Faith took actual shape amongst the Continental Reformers was in 1529. In this year a document was put forth known by the name of the "Schwabach Articles," so called from the Convent[1] where they were drawn up. They were seventeen in number, and were really a corrected copy of the text offered at Marburg to the Zwinglians, and refused by them[2] as too conservative and Lutheran in their tone.

ii. **The Augsburg Confession.** The Schwabach Articles formed the groundwork of a still more important document, which, under the name of the "Augsburg Confession," was presented to the Emperor Charles V. at the Diet of Augsburg on the 25th of June 1530. It was drawn up by Melancthon in Latin and German, and was signed by John, the Elector of Saxony, George the Markgrave of Brandenburg, and other members of the Diet.

iii. **The Latin draft** of this document was sent May 11, 1530 to Luther, then in the Castle of Coburg

[1] Schwabach was a small town in Bavaria, nine miles south-west of Nuremberg, upon a small river of the same name.

[2] From this time dates the great feud between the Lutherans and the followers of Zwingli. Hardwick's *Reformation*, pp. 57 sqq.

on the Saxon frontier, with a request from the Elector of Saxony that he would read and revise it. His reply, dated May 15, was as follows:—"I have read over the Apology of Master Philip: it pleases me very well, and I know of nothing whereby I could better it or change it, nor would it be becoming, for I cannot tread so gently and softly. May Christ our Lord help, that it may bring forth much and great fruit, as we hope and pray. Amen[1]." The doctrinal matter of this Confession was due to Luther, while Melancthon's scholarly and methodical mind elaborated it into its final shape and form, and breathed into it a moderate, conservative tone[2].

iv. **The Importance** of this Confession does not consist in its completeness as a system of doctrine, to which it does not pretend, but in the fact that it formed an apologetic statement in reference to many points which were then in dispute, and also exercised a great influence in England. It was distinguished by a marked moderation of tone, and while it steered a middle path between the teaching of the past and the new movements now in progress, it strove to preserve everything primitive and Catholic, and protested against modern distortions and innovations[3].

v. **Analysis.** The Augsburg Confession consisted of two parts. The first part had reference to matters of faith; the second to those Roman abuses which were deemed most objectionable:—

(α) *Part i.* consisted of twenty-two Articles:—

(*a*) The first six Articles treated of the Trinity, Original Sin, the Incarnation, Life, Death,

[1] Luther's *Briefe*, iv. 17; see Hardwick *Articles*, pp. 16, 17.
[2] Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, i. p. 229.
[3] Hardwick's *Hist. Articles*, p. 16.

Resurrection, and Ascension of our Lord, the Ministry of the Church, and the relation between Faith and Works;

(*b*) The next eight Articles treated of the Church, Baptism, the Eucharist, Confession, Penance, the Use of the Sacraments, and Holy Orders;

(*c*) The following seven Articles (i) vindicated the authority of the Civil Power, the lawfulness of war, property, and oaths; (ii) asserted the ancient doctrine of the Resurrection and the Final Judgment; (iii) dealt with free will, original sin, good works, and the invocation of saints.

(β) *Part ii.* consisted of seven Articles:—
They formed a kind of Appendix, and treated of certain abuses relating to (1) Communion in both kinds; (2) Clerical Celibacy; (3) Obligatory Confession; (4) the Mass; (5) ceremonial feasts and fasts; (6) monastic vows; (7) the secular power of the bishops[1].

vi. **Result.** This rough analysis sufficiently proves how anxious the compilers of "the Apology," as they term it, were to keep as much as possible within the boundaries of the Western Church, and to diverge as little as possible from primitive and Catholic uses. The presentation of the document excited great discussion, and the moderate party found themselves unable to make head against the more violent Mediævalists. Finally it was agreed that till some general Council could be summoned, the Reformers should be directed to appoint no more married priests, to teach

[1] Hardwick's *Hist. Articles*, pp. 17—23; Aubrey Moore's *Hist. Reform.* pp. 378, 379.

the duty of Confession, to allow the celebration of private Masses, and accept the validity of Communion in one kind. Thus all hopes of reconciliation were broken off, and the schemes of the more moderate of both parties were frustrated[1].

[1] See Ranke, *Reform.* iii. 310.

CHAPTER III.

The English Articles of 1536 *and* 1538.

i. **English movements.** From the Continent we come to our own land. Here, four years after the Diet of Augsburg, the English Church definitely threw off the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome[1], and an attempt was made for the first time to deal with the question of doctrine during the reign of Henry VIII.

ii. **The Ten Articles.** Accordingly in 1536 the Ten Articles were published, "devised by the king's highnesse majestie to stablyshe christen quietnes and unitie amonges us, and to avoyde contentious opinions." Of these Articles it is probable that a rough draft was made by a committee of the moderate divines of each party, presided over by the King himself, or placed in frequent communication with him, and that this draft, after various modifications subsequently made, was submitted to the Upper House of Convocation for further criticism. The compilers of these Articles having stated their object to be the establish-

[1] The first steps taken towards a separation from Rome were taken in a constitutional manner. In 1530 an Act of Parliament was passed, which forbade an application to Rome for dispensations from certain English Laws. In 1531 all money payments claimed by the Roman see were forbidden to be paid any more. In 1533 a third Act was passed forbidding any appeal to Rome from the English Courts. In 1534 Convocation, the Parliament of the Church, decided that the Popes had no more right given them by God over the kingdom than any other foreign bishop. These acts simply reclaimed the ancient independence of the English State and the English Church. See Lord Selborne's *Defence*, pp. 28—31.

ment of charitable concord and unity, proceed to draw a distinction between such things as are expressly commanded by God, and are necessary to salvation, and such things as, though not expressly commanded by God nor necessary to salvation, should yet be preserved :—

(i) *The things necessary to be believed* are

(α) The grounds of Faith, viz. the Bible, the three Creeds, the Four Holy Councils, and the Traditions of the Fathers which are not contrary to God's word ;

(β) The Sacrament of Baptism, the Sacrament of Penance, the Sacrament of the Altar, Justification.

(ii) *The things to be retained though not necessary to salvation* are

Veneration of Images, Honour due unto Saints, Praying to Saints, Rites and Ceremonies, Purgatory.

iii. **Their Features.** The Ten Articles testify to a compromise between the champions of the Old and the New Learning[1]. They represent a transition period, and embody the ideas of men who were gradually emerging into a different sphere of thought, and reflect the essential tenets of the Mediæval School, simply substituting the Royal for the Papal Supremacy. They were in many ways extremely well calculated for the guidance of the Clergy in the instruction of the people[2]. This early set of Articles, however, was received with the greatest hostility in the North, and the disaffected of all classes flew to arms in vindication of the ancient system. It was virtually superseded in the next year, 1537, by the "Institution of a

[1] Aubrey Moore's *Hist. Reform.* pp. 137, 138.

[2] See Perry's *Reformation*, p. 44.

Christian Man[1]," and was eventually supplanted by the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man," or the "King's Book" set forth in 1543.

iv. **The Conferences.** Two years after the promulgation of the Ten Articles, or 1538, a deputation of three German divines[2] came over to this country, and by order of Henry VIII. many conferences took place between them and a select committee of English theologians headed by Cranmer. The result was the compilation of Thirteen Articles on some of the leading points of the Christian Faith. This manifesto is of special interest as supplying the groundwork of the Articles now in use.

v. **The Thirteen Articles** were discovered in their collected form by Dr Jenkyns among the MSS. of Archbishop Cranmer in the State Paper Office[3]. They treat of the Unity of God and the Trinity[4], Original Sin[5], the Two Natures of Christ[6], Justification[7], the Church[8], Baptism, the Eucharist, Penance, the Use of the Sacraments[9], the

[1] Or "the Bishop's Book," set forth though without any formal sanction from Convocation or the Crown, a copy of which with the King's annotations still exists in the Bodleian.

[2] They were Francis Burckhardt, vice-chancellor to the Elector of Saxony, George Boyneburg, a nobleman of Hesse and doctor of laws, and Frederic Mekum or Myconius, "superintendent" (quasi-bishop) of the Church of Gotha. "Burckhardt was the head of the legation and bore with him a commendatory letter to King Henry, dated May 12, 1538." Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 56.

[3] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 59, 60.

[4] This Article is almost a verbal copy of Art. i. of the Augsburg Confession, and includes the first of the xlii. Articles of Edward VI.

[5] It corresponds with the 2nd of the Augsburg Series, and like the 8th of the xlii. Articles speaks of "peccatum *originale*" instead of "peccatum *originis*," and contains the expression "originalis justitia," which is not in the Augsburg Series. Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 62.

[6] This Article contains almost the very words of our present second Article, and the "*vere* resurrexit" of Article iv.

[7] Like the 4th of the Augsburg Series it affirms that men are accepted by God "gratis propter Christum per fidem."

[8] This Article includes the 23rd and the 24th of the Edwardine Series, but uses language in both cases not found in the Augsburg Confession.

[9] Its language is almost identical with the 29th of the xlii. Articles.

Ministers of the Church, Ecclesiastical Rites, Civil Affairs, the Resurrection, and Final Judgment.

vi. **The Six Articles.** Interesting, however, as it is to notice the relation of these Articles to the subsequent series, the discussions between the foreign and English theologians roused the polemical spirit of Henry VIII., who was determined to maintain Communion in one kind, private Masses, and the celibacy of the Clergy[1]. Consequently the Conferences were broken off, and the King not only issued a proclamation denouncing penalties against married priests, but under the influence of Bishop Gardiner promulgated the Six Articles Law in 1539[2]. These Articles are important as representing the farthest point to which the reaction in this monarch's reign extended, and a serious attempt to enforce by terrible penalties[3] religious doctrine as part of the Statute Law. They enforced (i) a belief in Transubstantiation; (ii) the needlessness of Communion in both kinds; (iii) Clerical celibacy; (iv) the obligation of vows of chastity; (v) the use and efficacy of private Masses; (vi) the obligation of auricular confession.

[1] For the ascendancy at court at this time of Bishop Gardiner see Hardwick's *Hist. Reform.* p. 189, and notes.

[2] These Articles were first resolved by Convocation, and then accepted by Parliament. Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 189.

[3] Those who wrote, spoke, or preached against the first Article were to be burned as heretics "without any abjuration." Those who preached or obstinately disputed against the others were to be hanged as felons. Those who spoke against them in any way were to be imprisoned. Married priests were to be separated from their wives; if they returned to them they were to be hanged as felons, and their wives were to suffer in like manner. Those who abstained from confession or the Sacrament of the Altar were for the first offence to forfeit their goods and be imprisoned; for the second to suffer as felons. Perry's *Reformation*, pp. 52, 53. The Act was repealed by 1 Edw. VI. 12. "The principle of making heresy an offence against the Common Law as against the Canon Law had been propounded in England so early as A.D. 1406. Comp. Stubbs, *Constit. Hist.* iii. p. 362. Ed. 1878.

CHAPTER IV.

The Articles in the reign of Edward VI.

i. **Accession of Edward VI.** On the death of Henry VIII. in 1547 and the accession of Edward VI. an opportunity seemed to be presented for carrying out a plan which had hitherto borne but little fruit, and producing a body of Articles for the English Church. Accordingly Cranmer began by issuing in 1549 a Book of Articles to be circulated only in the Southern Province for the purpose of testing the orthodoxy of all lecturers and preachers in Divinity. By these the Primate hoped at all events in his own Diocese to check those members of the Reforming party who were developing eccentric opinions and irregular modes of action, and to promote unity of opinions[1].

ii. **Need of New Articles.** But before long Cranmer saw that something more was needed to secure an adequate amount of harmony amongst preachers, lecturers, and others, and in 1551 he was directed by the King and Council to frame a body of Articles, which should be more developed than those he had already drawn up. This quite fell in with the Primate's earnest desire that a Confession of Faith, set forth by authority, should state

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Reformation*, p. 211.

the doctrines of the Church of England as against the Canons then being fashioned at Trent.

iii. **Their Compilation.** Accordingly the task was undertaken and busily prosecuted during the year 1551. Drafts of Articles drawn up by Cranmer and Ridley were forwarded for their consideration to such bishops and divines as it was thought could be trusted for the work. They remained in their hands till the spring of the following year, 1552, when the Council requested that the draft of the Confession might be laid before them[1]. This was done, and the Articles were then returned to the Archbishop, who after adding titles and some supplementary clauses submitted them to the king[2]. Edward VI. gave them for review to six chaplains, who sent them again to the Archbishop with some suggestions for "the last corrections of his judgment and his pen." The Primate remitted them after review to the Council, and it seems probable that they were submitted to Convocation in March 1553. Whether they received the formal sanction of Convocation is a matter of dispute[3], but in compliance with Cranmer's wish it seems that a mandate was issued June 19, 1553, in the name of the king, requiring that the

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 73, 74.

[2] "I have sent the Book of Articles for Religion unto Mr Cheke, set in a better order, than it was, and the titles upon every matter, adding thereto that which lacked." Cranmer to Cecil, Sep. 19, 1552; Strype's Cranmer, ii. App. No. lxvi.

[3] Writing to Bullinger, Sir John Cheke says of the king, "Nuper Articulos Synodi Londinensis promulgavit." John Clement, a martyr in the Marian persecution, says in his Confession, "I do accept, believe, and allow, for a very truth all the godly Articles that were agreed upon in the Convocation House, and published by the King's Majesty's authority, in the last year of his most gracious reign." Strype, *Eccl. Memorials*, iii. App. 215. On this vexed question see Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 106—112; Dixon, iii. 513 sqq. holds that they had no Synodical authority. Tierney in Dodd, *Church Hist. of England*, ii. p. 58 states that on October 20th, 1553, "the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, with only five dissentients, signed a paper denying that the Articles set forth in the late reign had received the sanction of that body," basing his statement on Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, iii. p. 16.

new form should be publicly subscribed, and in the few remaining days of Edward's reign the order was apparently obeyed, at least to some extent, in two or three dioceses of the realm.

iv. **The Articles** thus issued were Forty-two in number, and when compared with the present Thirty-nine we notice that they exhibit certain additions and certain omissions:—

(*a*) *Certain Additions:*—

(i) An important supplementary clause in the Third Article respecting the preaching of Christ in Hades; (ii) An Article on Grace[1]; (iii) An Article on Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost[2]; (iv) An Article stating that "all men are bound to keep the moral commandments of the Law"[3]; (v) An important clause in the 29th Article respecting the Holy Eucharist; (vi) Four Articles, xxxix—xlii, setting forth that (*a*) the resurrection of the dead has not yet been brought to pass, (*b*) the souls of the departed neither die with their bodies, nor sleep idly, (*c*) the teaching of the Millenarii cannot be accepted, (*d*) all men shall not be saved in the end.

(*b*) *Certain Omissions:*—

(i) The present Fifth Article respecting the Holy Ghost; (ii) the Catalogue of the Canonical Books attached to the 6th Article; (iii) the present 12th Article on "Good Works"; (iv) the present 29th, "Of the

[1] The old Tenth Article.
[2] The old Sixteenth Article.
[3] The old Nineteenth Article.

Wicked which eat not the Body of Christ in the Use of the Lord's Supper"; (v) the present 30th Article respecting Communion in both kinds; (vi) the Catalogue of the second Book of Homilies as given in Article XXXV.

v. **Death of Edward VI.** But before the new Manifesto, thus drawn up and issued, could be adequately discussed by the Clergy, Edward VI., who had long been ailing, passed away on the 6th of July, 1553[1]. Thus the very year, which witnessed the publication of this body of Articles, witnessed also their practical abrogation, for the accession of Mary put an end to all the movements of the men of "the New Learning," and to all the hopes of the Reforming party.

[1] The anniversary, as pious Roman Catholics did not fail to observe, of the execution of Sir Thomas More. See Froude, iv. p. 179.

CHAPTER V.

The Articles in the reign of Elizabeth.

i. **The Accession of Elizabeth** revived the hopes of the Reformers, but it was some time before the subject of the Articles was taken in hand, and for the first four years of the new reign there was no doctrinal standard for the English Church beyond that which was contained in the Prayer Book. The fact was the Queen far more earnestly desired to re-establish the Service Book and enforce discipline, than to put forth any sharp delimitations of doctrine, which would shut out the more moderate section of the Roman party, whom she desired to include within the Church.

ii. **The Eleven Articles.** During the interval, however, the Bishops found it necessary to put forth a short form, contained in Eleven Articles, which were to be accepted by the Clergy, and publicly professed by them not only on admission to their benefices, but also read twice every year after the Gospel for the day[1]. They were compiled in 1559 or early in 1560 under the eye of Archbishop Parker, and received the sanction of the Northern Metropolitan, and most of the other English prelates. But they had no legal or binding character, and were not ratified by the Queen, though in 1566 they were legalized for the

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, *p.* 118.

Church of Ireland, and constituted the sole formulary of that Church till 1615[1].

iii. **Revision of the Forty-two Articles.** At length it was proposed to reconsider the Forty-two Articles of Edward VI., on the assembling of the first Elizabethan Convocation in January 1562. Already before it met, Parker had been busy upon them, and had been assisted by several of his brother prelates, and especially by Bishop Cox of Ely, and Guest, now Bishop of Rochester. They took the Latin Articles of 1553 as the basis of their revision, and the results of their preliminary criticisms are preserved in the Parker MSS. now in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. As Cranmer had used for a model the Confession of Augsburg, so Parker, instead of consulting the Swiss Confessions, which favoured the views of the more extreme Marian exiles[2], had recourse to the Confession of Würtemberg, which had been presented to the Council of Trent in 1552 by the ambassadors of that State.

iv. **The Effect** of this searching criticism by the Primate and his colleagues was

(i) *To add Four Articles*, viz.

(1) Of the Holy Ghost (v); (2) Of Good Works (xii); (3) Of the Wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ (xxix); (4) Of Communion in both kinds (xxx):—

(ii) *To take away an equal number:*

(1) The Article on Grace (x); (2) that on Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost (xvi); (3) that to the effect that all men are bound to

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 120, and notes.
[2] Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 230, and notes. Ed. 1880.

keep the moral Commandments of the Law (xix), which was now incorporated into Article vii.; (4) that concerning Heretics called Millenarii (xli):—

(iii) *To modify by partial amplification or curtailment as many as seventeen of the remainder*[1].

v. **Adoption by Convocation.** The Synod of Canterbury began to consider the Articles on Jan. 19, 1563. As first presented to this body they were, by reason of the balance in previous changes, still forty-two in number. But on the 29th of the month, the date of the Episcopal subscriptions, three were erased. These were the 39th, 40th, and 42nd of the series of 1552, which related to various Anabaptist theories[2]. The whole number was now reduced to Thirty-nine, and in this form the document was sent down to the Lower House. Here, after some delay, it was subscribed by the majority, and forwarded to the Queen for ratification.

vi. **The Queen's Ratification.** It was some time before this was given. When, however, the Latin copy with the ratification was issued from the Royal Press the Twenty-ninth Article relating to "Unworthy participation of the Eucharist" was found wanting, and the clause affirming that "the Church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of Faith[3]," appeared at the commencement of the Twentieth Article. A

[1] Amongst modifications notice (1) the addition in Article xxviii. of the words "sacramenti naturam evertit"; (2) the addition in the same Article of the statement "Corpus Christi...tantum cœlesti et spirituali ratione," both due to Bishop Guest; (3) the removal from Article xxv. of the implied condemnation of the view that Sacraments confer grace *ex opere operato*.

[2] See above, p. 16. The cause of their suppression was probably the comparative disappearance of the Anabaptist sect, whose theories had previously been denounced.

[3] In the troublous times of Charles I., Archbishop Laud was actually accused of having introduced this clause.

great dispute has arisen about this clause. In the English copy of the Articles, which was printed soon after the Latin copy was issued bearing the Queen's ratification, it does not appear. The change was probably introduced by the Royal Council in compliance with the wishes of the Queen, or the scruples of her chief advisers[1], and thus the number of the Articles was reduced to Thirty-eight.

vii. **The revision of 1571.** In 1566, when the vestment controversy had reached its highest point, an attempt was made in Parliament to carry an Act making subscription to the Articles binding on all the Clergy. The Copy specified in the Bill was the English Version of 1563, which lacked the clause in the Twentieth Article inserted by the Queen, and also the Twenty-ninth Article. Whatever was the cause, whether it was the omission of this clause she had inserted, or her great dislike to any interference by Parliament in matters of religion, certain it is that the Bill, having passed the Commons, was abruptly "stayed" by the Queen's command in the House of Lords[2]. This greatly annoyed the Bishops, and they in vain remonstrated. It was not till May 1571 that an Act was passed by both Houses of Parliament and received the Royal assent, which enacted that all the Clergy shall before Christmas next, in the presence of their Ordinaries, subscribe the Book of the Articles of Religion. They were now carefully revised in Convocation. The clause inserted in the Twentieth Article was now accepted[3], and the

[1] Cardwell's *Synod*, i. pp. 38, 39, Ed. 1842; Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 143, 144.

[2] Her alleged reason was not "that she disliked the doctrine of the Book of Religion, for that it containeth the religion which she doth openly profess, but the manner of putting forth the Book." Parker's *Correspond.*, p. 291; Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 148.

[3] "The disputed clause occurs in the English copy of the Articles, subscribed by the Southern Convocation in 1604, and by the Northern in 1605. It enters therefore into the series contemplated by the 36th Canon." Hardwick, p. 155.

Twenty-ninth having been restored, they were in this form subscribed, while the revision of the English edition[1] was entrusted to Bishop Jewel. The shape given to them by Jewel is that which has been retained ever since, and the Ratification[2] still subjoined in our Prayer Books is the same as that which was put forth in the reign of Elizabeth.

[1] As regards the English and Latin versions, the words of Waterland are important:—"I might justly say," he writes, "with Bishop Burnet, that the Latin and English are both equally authentical. Thus much, however, I may certainly infer, that if in any places the English version be ambiguous, where the Latin original is clear and determinate, the Latin ought to fix the more doubtful sense of the other (as also *vice versâ*), it being evident that the Convocation, Queen, and Parliament intended the same sense in both." Waterland, *Works*, ii. 317. Oxf. 1843.

[2] From this Ratification we learn (i) that the Articles are "allowed to be holden and executed within the Realme," by the assent and consent of the Queen, (ii) that they were deliberately read, and confirmed, and subscribed by the Archbishops and Bishops of the Upper House, (iii) that they were subscribed by the whole clergy of the Nether House in their Convocation, in the year of our Lord, 1571.

GROUP I.

ARTICLES 1—5.

The Articles in this group relate to God as He has revealed Himself to us.

They treat of

(α) The essential attributes of God and His mode of existence in three Persons, or the mystery of the Trinity in Unity (Art. i.);

(β) The nature and work of the Son of God:

(1) His Life and Ministry on Earth, including His Incarnation, Passion, and Sacrifice upon the Cross (Art. ii.);

(2) His descent into Hades (Art. iii.);

(3) His Resurrection, Ascension, and Future Coming to Judgment (Art. iv.);

(γ) The Deity and Personality of the Holy Ghost (Art. v.).

Article I.

1563.	1571.
De fide in Sanctam Trinitatem.	*Of fayth in the holy Trinitie.*
Vnvs est viuus et uerus Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, impassibilis, immensæ potentiæ, sapientiæ ac bonitatis : creator et conseruator omnium tum uisibilium tum inuisibilium. Et in Vnitate huius diuinæ naturæ tres sunt Personæ, eiusdem essentiæ, potentiæ, ac æternitatis, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus sanctus.	There is but one lyuyng and true God, euerlastyng, without body, partes, or passions, of infinite power, wysdome, and goodnesse, the maker and preseruer of al things both visible and inuisible. And in vnitie of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substaunce, power, and eternitie, the Father, the Sonne, and the Holy Ghost.

i. **Subject.** The first Five Articles, as we have seen, treat of the Fundamental Doctrines of the Catholic Faith. Of these the first relates to the Holy Trinity, and the Title has remained uniform in Latin and English since 1553.

ii. **Source.** The source of the Article is the corresponding First Article of the Augsburg Confession[1], derived apparently through the medium of the Thirteen Articles of 1538. The language has suffered no material alteration since the first draft.

[1] Compare the words of the First Article of the Augsburg Confession: "De Unitate Essentiæ Divinæ et de Tribus Personis, censemus decretum Nicenæ Synodi verum, et sine ulla dubitatione credendum esse, videlicet, quod sit una Essentia Divina, quæ et appellatur et est Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, immensâ potentiâ, sapientiâ, bonitate, Creator et Conservator omnium rerum visibilium et invisibilium, et tamen tres sint Personæ ejusdem essentiæ et potentiæ, et coæternæ, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus." Comp. also the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, De Summâ Trinitate, c. 2.

iii. **Object.** The object of the Article is to defend the doctrine of the Trinity against unbelievers, Polytheists and Pantheists[1], and against all, who, under the disguise of Anabaptists, were reviving in the sixteenth century some of the chief errors of Arianism, Sabellianism, and kindred heresies.

iv. **Analysis.** The Article may be divided into two parts :—

(1) It treats of the existence, unity and attributes of God ;

(2) It states the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

PART I.

(α)

The Existence of God.

v. **The Existence of God.** This, the fundamental conception of religion, the Article assumes on Scriptural grounds, for *he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that seek after Him* (Heb. xi. 6). It is indeed impossible to demonstrate the existence of God in such a way as shall admit of no contradiction. Were it possible, it would involve the exclusion of faith, and of the moral qualities which are inseparable from faith. The evidence, however, of His existence, which comes from several different and independent sources, may be arranged as follows :—

(1) *The Evidence of Consciousness :*—The thought of God is latent in the human mind, its earliest,

[1] Comp. Article i. of the Thirteen Articles : " Damnamus omnes hæreses contra hunc articulum exortas, ut Manichæos, qui duo principia ponebant, bonum et malum ; item Valentinos, Arianos, Eunomianos, Mahometistas, et omnes horum similes."

its most universal, its most ineradicable conception. The most ordinary and fundamental ideas, those, for instance, of time, space, growth, and the like presuppose the existence of a Being superior to time or space. "The soul does not willingly consent to regard so inspiring a conception as a *mere* thought. To consider it as unreal, with no counterpart in the realm of actual existence, is felt as a bereavement and a pain[1]." Man cannot help thinking of God. "He learns to pray before he learns to reason[2]."

(2) *The Evidence of General Consent:*—There is no age so distant, no country so remote, no people so barbarous, but they have testified in some form or other to the existence of One higher, greater, than themselves. This is a great spiritual fact, running through the entire history of the human race in all ages, and it is impossible to conceive that this universal belief in God is the result of accident. We trace the conviction of the being of One, Who is the Foundation of all existence, in the Vedic[3] and

[1] See *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* by Professor Fisher, p. 40; McCosh's *Intuitions of the Mind*, p. 191, *n.*; Flint's *Theism*, p. 264.

[2] Mansel's *Limits of Religious Thought*, p. 115, "Man feels within him the consciousness of a Supreme Being, and the instinct of worship, before he can argue from effects to causes, or estimate the traces of wisdom and benevolence scattered through the creation." "Belief in God...has an intellectual foundation deeper than almost any other article of the Creed." Bp of Carlisle, *Foundation of the Creed*, p. 32. Speaking in the Debate on the Socialist Bill, Oct. 1878, Prince Bismarck is reported to have said that "he would not desire to live a day longer, if he had not what Schiller calls the 'belief in God and a better future'." Ibid. p. 36, *n.* Even Cicero speaks of "insitas Deorum, vel potius innatas cognitiones," as holding their place in the background of all hearts, *De Nat. Deorum*, i. 17. 44, and see Christlieb, *Modern Doubt and Christian Belief*, p. 141. Transl., Edinburgh, 1874.

[3] In speaking of the Vedic deities, Prof. Max Müller makes the following comment: "Whenever one of

Zoroastrian[1] systems, in those of Greece and Rome[2], in that of Confucius[3], in the religion of ancient Egypt[4], as well as in those of the Kaffir and Zulu races and the tribes of Central Africa, amongst the lowest as well as the highest races of mankind[5].

(3) *The Evidence of Nature.* The feeling of man, common alike to the child and to the scientist, in the presence of Nature is one of wonder. Such wonder is, if not the basis of, at least closely allied to religious awe[6]. But Nature does more than thus impress us; she invites us

these individual gods is invoked, they are not conceived as limited by the powers of others, as superior or inferior in rank. Each god is to the mind of the supplicant as good as all gods. He is felt, at the time, as a real divinity, as supreme and absolute." *Chips from a German Workshop*, i. p. 27. See the remarkable Hymn referred to by Max Müller, Rig Veda, x. 129, translated in Muir's *Sanskrit Texts*, Vol. iv. p. 4.

[1] "The Duad, with the Monad brooding behind it," as has most truly been said, "is the fundamental principle of the Avesta, and of the old and once wide-spread faith that is set forth in its venerable Hymns." Bp Ellicott's *The Being of God*, p. 36. For Bishop Butler's reference to "the general consent of mankind," see *Analogy*, Introduction, i. p. 7.

[2] "Even through the vista of the mixed deities of the pantheon of Rome, half national and half utilitarian, we just catch sight of one supreme and ultimate Being, a Jupiter Optimus-Maximus of whom all other deities were but the manifestations and attributes." Ibid. p. 37.

[3] See Legge, *Life and Teachings of Confucius*, p. 100, alluded to by Bp Ellicott, p. 38, *n.*

[4] In ancient Egypt I AM THAT I AM appears, almost beyond doubt, to have been the object of esoteric worship which was taught to the initiated. Clarke, *Ten Great Religions*, pp. 242, 251. On the avowedly atheistic feature of Buddhism, see Bp Ellicott's *Being of God*, pp. 40, 41; Prof. Flint's *Antitheistic Theories*, p. 282 sq.

[5] "The result of my investigation," says De Quatrefages, "is this: Obliged, in my course of instruction, to review all human races, I have sought atheism in the lowest as well as in the highest. I have nowhere met with it, except in individuals or in more or less limited schools, such as those which existed in Europe in the last century, or which may still be seen at the present day." *The Human Species*, p. 482 (E. Transl.).

[6] "The mysteries of the Church are child's play compared with the mysteries of nature. The doctrine of the Trinity is not more puzzling than the necessary antinomies of physical speculation; virgin procreation, and resuscitation from apparent death, are ordinary phenomena for the naturalist." Huxley, *Letter to the late Dean of Wells*, quoted in Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 246, 247.

both to trace her to her source, and to investigate her special purposes and her general end. Causation leads the enquirer to the limit of the ken of science, where he is left in the presence of the Great Unknown. We trace effects back to their causes; but these causes are found to be also effects[1]. The path is endless. There is no goal. There is no rest or satisfaction[2], save in the assumption of the existence of a "Causa Causans," a supreme First Cause, itself more exalted than all, and therefore self-existent and eternal, and which can be no inert or formless matter[3].

(4) *The Evidence of Design.* When we attend to the various objects of which we take cognizance in the world of nature, we discover something more than the properties, which distinguish them one from another, and the causes which bring them into being. In the process of investigation we are struck with the fact that there is a co-operation of causes for the pro-

[1] "There is an absurdity involved in the idea of an endless regress, of an infinite series, in the succession of whose limits no causal energy, or cause answerable to the demand of reason, is contained." Prof. Fisher, *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, p. 42. "Napoleon's *savants*, Bourrienne tells us, in that voyage to Egypt, were one evening busily occupied arguing that there could be no God. They had proved it, to their satisfaction, by all manner of logic. Napoleon, looking up into the stars, answers, 'Very ingenious, Messieurs; but *who made* all that?' The Atheistic logic runs off from him like water; the great Fact stares him in the face, 'Who made all that?'" Carlyle's *Lectures on Heroes*, Lect. VI. p. 385. "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind." Bacon's *Essays*, Atheism, *ad init.* For Scriptural statements of the knowledge of God as derived from Nature, see Psalm xix. 1; Isai. xlv. 18; Acts xiv. 15—17; Rom. i. 19, 20.

[2] Flint's *Theism*, pp. 118—124.

[3] "No one has ever yet built up one particle of living matter out of lifeless elements; every living creature, from the simplest dweller on the confines of organization up to the highest and most complete, has its origin in pre-existent living matter." Prof. Allman, *Address to British Association.*

duction of definite effects[1]. These causes are so disposed as to concur in the production of the effect, and that of necessity. We assume that they concur in order that the result may follow. This assumption of design is the result of no effort on our part. It is spontaneous. The conviction of *design* is brought home to us by the objects themselves. "We see a thought realised and thus recognise in it a *fore*-thought[2]." The observation of order and adaptation in nature inspires the conviction of a designing Mind concerned in its origination[3], which possesses the full intelligence[4] of all these adaptations to definite ends, and is itself the Supreme Cause of all[5].

[1] See Ebrard's *Christian Apologetics*, Vol. i. pp. 170—172. English Translation, 1886.

[2] "This thought has impressed the philosopher and the peasant alike. Socrates enforced the argument by the illustration of a statue, as Paley, two thousand years later, by the illustration of a watch." Prof. Fisher, *Grounds of Belief*, p. 43. See Flint's *Theism*, Lec. v., vi.; Liddon's *Some Elements*, pp. 53—55; Mozley's *Essays*, Vol. ii. pp. 363—413.

[3] "When we see a purpose carried out, we are impelled to trace the operation to an intelligent Author, whether the end is obtained by an agency acting from within or from without. The accurate mathematics of the planetary bodies, marking out for themselves their orbits, the unerring path of the birds, the geometry of the bee, the seed-corn sending upward the blossoming and fruit-bearing stalk, excite a wonder, the secret of which is the insufficiency of the operative cause to effect these marvels of intelligence and foresight." See Bp Ellicott's *Being of God*, pp. 84—111.

[4] "Science will not allow us to say that things made themselves, or are their own causes. The only alternative is that they were made by some external power, and any power which could contrive and execute all the complex machinery of the heavens and the earth, or could initiate anything capable of developing such machinery, must be practically infinite and must possess those attributes of superhuman power and superhuman wisdom which belong only to God." Sir William Dawson, *Present Day Tracts*, vii. 5; Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 79, E. T.

[5] The Psalmist says (xciv. 9), "He that made the ear, shall He not hear? And He that made the eye, shall He not see?" Why not add? "He that made the mind shall He not think?" Liddon's *Some Elements*, p. 53. Scientific study favours the view that matter itself is an effect. If we accept the hypothesis of molecules as the ultimate forms of matter, Sir John Herschel finds in each of these, as related to the others, "the essential qualities of a manufactured article."

(5) *The Evidence of Conscience.* Conscience is man's faculty of *knowing together* with God (*conscientia*), the relation of his personal being to God[1]. Every man has a voice within him, which says to him, "This is right, this is wrong"; "This is your duty, this is not your duty." "This voice within gives no proof, appeals to no evidence, but speaks as having a right to command, and requires of a man his obedience by virtue of its own inherent superiority[2]." Now it is impossible to dissociate this mysterious Voice, which utters "the moral imperative" within the soul[3], from the Being of all beings, the supreme Vindicator of the moral Law, to whom we stand in a personal relation, and who has a claim upon the obedience of us all[4].

(6) *The Argument from History*:—At first sight nothing is more intricate and anomalous than the history of the different nations of the earth.

[1] "Every man bears in himself the ethical law as a determinateness of his peculiar essence...In the ethical law the personal, holy God gives practical proof of Himself as One addressing Himself to the will of man." Ebrard's *Apologetics*, Eng. Trans. i. p. 250. Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 6, E. T.

[2] See Bp Temple's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 47. "Conscience is no descendant of our will or our reason. It is no product of our own mind. It is the product of a moral spirit above and beyond ourselves, whose voice speaks to us through conscience." Luthardt's *Fundamental Truths*, p. 54.

[3] Butler, in his *Sermons on Human Nature*, says of the conscience, "Had it the power as it has manifest authority, it would absolutely govern the world." But authority presupposes power. The conscience has authority because it witnesses to a law, a purpose, of One Who has the power upon which its own authority must rest. Strong's *Syst. Theol.*, p. 46; Liddon's *Some Elements*, pp. 66—70.

[4] "Ethical enquiry, where it is true to its subject matter, postulates an absolute and superhuman law of righteousness, with which men are as truly brought into relation through conscience, as they are, through the eye, into relation to the objective reality of light"; Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 31; see also Liddon, *Some Elements of Religion*, pp. 69, 71.

It seems at first an inextricable coil of men and actions. Then it seems a constant recurrence of the same events under different forms. Then on closer observation it is discovered that it contains a providential order and a moral order within it[1]. Thoughtful men[2] admit that the course of human history exhibits continual progress towards a more and more perfect exhibition of righteousness and goodness[3]. The history of social life, of nations, crime, law, and religion, supplies abundant evidence of this. But a moral government of the world and an education of the human race imply a moral Governor and Educator. For an unconscious government, an unconscious education of the human race according to moral laws, is a contradiction in terms, a simple impossibility[4].

vi. **The Force of the arguments** thus advanced for the existence of God is *cumulative*, and sufficient to produce in any unprejudiced mind a *moral certainty* that He exists[5]. They do not *originate* our faith in His existence. They justify it, and lead us to infer that our worship is due to God, and that our lives must be conformed to His will, however made known[6].

[1] Fisher's *Grounds of Belief*, p. 69; Flint's *Theism*, pp. 227—261.

[2] The evidences of physical and moral disorder in the world do not destroy the force of this argument; for (*a*) the most they can be said to prove is that the *complete* fulfilment of God's design has not yet been attained; (*b*) whatever may be the nature and origin of evil, it *does not defeat* the continual moral progress of the world; (*c*) there are abundant indications that God so overrules the forces of evil that He makes them instruments in accomplishing His own good designs.

[3] Butler's *Analogy*, Pt i. chap. vii.

[4] Flint's *Theism*, Lecture viii.; Liddon's *Some Elements*, pp. 142—148.

[5] Barry's *Boyle Lectures*, 1876, Lect. iii.; Strong's *Syst. Theol.*, p. 50; Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, chap. i. § 2.

[6] See S. Aug. *De Fide et Symbolo*, cap. 2; *The Doctrine of God*, F. J. Hall, pp. 46—55.

(β)

The Unity of God.

vii. **The Unity of God.** Belief in the existence of God implies a belief also in His Unity, as testified by the Nicene and other Eastern Creeds. If we rest our rational belief in the being of God upon the idea of cause, and speak of the necessity of conceiving an origin for the physical universe and for all phenomena, it is self-evident that we must needs conceive of only *One* cause. The idea of two first causes, self-existent and supreme, involves a manifest contradiction. The unity of God means the absolute distinction of His being[1], as original and independent and self-existing, from all other being. All other being must be regarded as dependent upon and derived from Him. He is the power of all being, the eternal life, self-originating and self-sufficing. He is His own eternal act, and hence the end and origin of all things[2]. The Unity of God is constantly and expressly affirmed in Holy Scripture, and was the great doctrine which Moses delivered to the Israelites:—

(α) *Hear, O Israel,* he saith, *the Lord our God is one Lord* (Deut. vi. 4);

(β) *The Lord He is God; there is none else beside Him* (Deut. iv. 35);

(γ) *This is the life eternal, that they might know Thee the only true God* (John xvii. 3);

[1] The *integral* unity of God does not signify the absence of real distinctions in His nature, but the absence of divisions simply. His tri-personal subsistence is not inconsistent with this. See Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, i. 11.

[2] "Deus si non unus est, non est... omnium conscientia agnosset, Deum summum esse magnum...si fuerit aliud summum magnum, adæquabitur, et si adæquabitur, non erit jam summum magnum." Tertullian *adv. Marcion.* i. 3.

(δ) *We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is none other God but one* (1 Cor. viii. 4)[1].

The Unity of God, that which other religions were feeling after and tending towards[2], stands out clearly and distinctly as the characteristic of the religion of Israel, and is fearlessly claimed as an inheritance from the patriarchal age.

(γ)

The Attributes of God.

viii. **Connection.** Having spoken of God as One, the Article proceeds to deal with His attributes:—and it states,

(i) That He is "living," "true," "eternal";

(α) *Living*, "Vivus." He is not simply viv*ens*, but viv*us*, the source of life, the only efficient principle, to Whom all things owe their existence[3].

[1] The Unity of God thus set before us is not numerical. There is no special virtue in the number *one*, which mathematicians describe as unity. It does not simply deny the existence of a second God. It is integral, denying the possibility of division. "Deus, cum unus dicitur, unus, non numeri sed universitatis vocabulo nuncupatur, id est, qui propterea unus dicitur quod alius non sit." Rufinus in *Symb. Apost.* c. 5. This is explained by Moses Maimonides thus: "God is one, not two, or more than two, but only one; whose unity is not like that of the individuals of this world; neither is it one by way of species, comprehending many individuals; neither one in the manner of a body which is divisible into parts and extremes; but in one, as no unity like His is to be found in the world." See the passage quoted by Bp Pearson *on the Creed*, Art. i.; Bp of Carlisle's *Foundations of the Creed*, p. 39.

[2] For the way in which the traditional polytheism was challenged in Greece by Plato and Xenophon, see *Lux Mundi*, pp. 69, 70, and the passages quoted from *The Republic*, pp. 377—385; *Theaet.* 176, c.

[3] Vivus denotes that God is the πηγὴ ζωῆς, the source of life, Fons et Origo Vitæ, or, as He is called in Scripture, Θεὸς ζῶν, "the God who lives." Comp. Acts xiv. 15; Rom. ix. 26; 2 Cor. iii. 3; vi. 16; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. iii. 12, and observe in each passage the emphasis laid upon the participle, whether by position or otherwise. See S. Thom. *Summ. Theol.* i. 18.

(β) *True*, "Verus[1]," for He is the one real, absolute God, in opposition to the unreal, false gods of heathenism, who have no substantial existence;

(γ) *Eternal*, "Æternus," for He hath neither beginning nor end[2]. He never began to be and never can cease to be. He is the one eternal "Now," *from everlasting to everlasting*[3] (Ps. xc. 2).

(ii) That He is "without body, parts, or passions":—

(α) *Without body*, "incorporeus[4]." We are apt to think of God in terms of human understanding, to acquire the habit of regarding Him as "a magnified, non-natural man." He has no body such as the human body. He is immaterial, He is *spirit*[5] (John iv. 24).

(β) *Without parts*[6], "impartibilis," for in Him

[1] Verus, ἀληθινός, not verax, ἀληθής. For the difference between the two words see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 83, *n.* For the application of the word to God see Joh. xvii. 3; τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν; 1 Thess. i. 9, θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ; 1 Joh. v. 20, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός.

[2] Time is a relation of created things and of finite events. When of things, it expresses their duration; when of events, it is the measure of their succession. But Divine eternity is an idea which transcends duration, and excludes all but logical succession. The Schoolmen describe it as "Interminabilis vitæ tota simul et perfecta possessio." S. Thos. i. 10 c.

[3] In the correct sense the Eternal is the supra-temporal, it is that which is without change and without succession; for time is the measure of change. As time is a fleeting *Now* that ever eludes our grasp, so eternity is a stationary *Now*, that is constantly present and constantly invariable. And this necessary association between the variable and the temporal leads us to conceive of the eternal God as the abiding and the real, and of the life of God as the Life which really *is*, "the Life which is Life indeed." "Fuisse et futurum esse non est in ea (vita divina), sed esse solum, quoniam æterna est. Nam fuisse et futurum esse non est æternum." S. Aug. *Conf.* ix. 10. 24.

[4] Incorporeus. The word occurs only in post-classical writers. Comp. Macrob. *S.* vii. 15, "De incorporeis disputat."

[5] See Westcott *in loc.*, and Dr Döllinger's *Conversations*, p. 219, Engl. Transl.

[6] Impartibilis generally appears in the form impertibilis, from *in* and *partior* = "that cannot be divided into parts, indivisible."

there is nothing divisible, inchoate, or incomplete, He is whole in Himself, in substance and essence, perfect and simple[1].

(γ) *Without passions*, "impassibilis." He is not subject, like man, to varying emotions which affect the perfect justice of His actions and His orderly conduct of the universe[2]. Thus in Numb. xxiii. 19 we read, *God is not a man that He should lie, nor the son of man that He should repent*; and again, Mal. iii. 6, He Himself says, *I am the Lord, I change not*; and S. James describes Him as *the Father of Lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning* (Jas. i. 17)[3].

(iii) That He is "of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness."

(α) *Of infinite*[4] *power*, "immensæ potentiæ," for

[1] "God is one in the simplest and strictest sense...as truly one as any individual soul or spirit is one; nay infinitely more so, for all creatures are imperfect, and He has all perfection." Newman, *Par. Sermons*, vi. 348.

[2] Impassibilis, from *in* and *patior*. The word is not found in Latin classical writers. It occurs only in ecclesiastical Latin. Thus Tertull. *Apol.* 10, "Deus impassibilis." For the use of the term in the Creed of Aquileia, comp. *Introd. to the Creeds*, pp. 21, 22.

[3] Scripture, however, justifies the ascription to God of such feelings as anger, jealousy, and the like, because such language is the only means of expressing to us that disturbance in the operation of the Divine attributes which is caused by sin. On the other hand, Scripture tells us that God is Love, but the attribute referred to as Love is something very different from the human emotion, for it is the very Divine Essence itself eternally operative between the Sacred Persons of the Blessed Trinity. His Love is that passionless and changeless movement of His essence, whereby He desires to gather into union with Himself all who are good. S. Thomas *Summ. Th.* i. 20; Martensen's *Dogmatics*, § 51; Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 39, 40. Thus S. Augustine, commenting on the expression τοῦ Υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης Αὐτοῦ, says, "Charitas quippe Patris quæ in Natura Ejus est ineffabiliter simplici, nihil est aliud quam Ejus ipsa Natura atque Substantia." S. Aug. *de Trinit.* xv. 19. 37.

[4] Immensus, from *in* and *metior*= *immeasurable, boundless*. Cp. Cic. *De Nat. Deor.* i. 10. 26, "Aëra deum statuit eumque gigni esseque immensum et infinitum." The moral limitations to the Divine Power are well put by S. Augustine; "Deus omnipotens est, et cum sit omnipotens, mori non potest,

He is Almighty, and can do all things that do not imply imperfection and that consist with His Attributes, so that *none can stay His Hand or say unto Him, What doest Thou?* (Job xlii. 2; Dan. iv. 35). His omnipotence signifies (*a*) His infinite energy and freedom to do all that is consistent with His nature; (*b*) His sovereignty over all that is or can be done[1].

(β) *Of infinite wisdom,* "sapientiæ." His wisdom is His absolute infallibility of judgment, by virtue of which He provides perfectly for all things and cannot err in any question of action. Prudence has been defined as choosing the best means to a certain end; Wisdom as choosing the best means to the best end. Now God alone knows what is the best end; He is the *only, wise God*[2] (Rom. xvi. 27), and as the Psalmist says, *great is His Power, yea and His wisdom is infinite* (Ps. cxlvii. 5). His wisdom, according to the teaching of S. Paul, is markedly exemplified by the economy of Redemption[3].

(γ) *Of infinite goodness,* "bonitatis." The term "goodness," as an attribute of God, is equivalent to the Greek word translated "kindness" in the Authorized and Revised Versions. It

falli non potest, mentiri non potest, et quod ait Apostolus, negare Se Ipsum non potest." *Ad Catech.* ii.

[1] See S. Thos. *Summ. Th.* i. 25; Schouppe *El. Th. Dog.*, v. 161—165; Martensen's *Dogmatics*, § 49.

[2] *Et sapientiae ejus non est numerus.* Vulg. The wisdom of God "non tantum cognitionem includit, sed etiam cognitioni operationem consentaneam." He is the μόνος σοφὸς Θεός, and has the characteristic of soleness, aloneness, in His wisdom. See Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] See 1 Cor. i. 23, 24; ii. 7; Eph. iii. 8—11, and note especially the phrase ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. iii. 10.

denotes the Divine Will realising itself in imparting happiness to the creature, according to the capacities of the creatures, and the counsels of Divine Wisdom[1]. It is that which in regard of human demerits we term "grace," in regard of human misery, "pity."

(iv) That He is "the Maker and Preserver of all things visible and invisible." The Article here refers almost in the language of the first clause of the Nicene Creed to the exercise of the operative attributes of God in the creation and preservation of the universe[2].

(*a*) *The Maker*, Creator[3].

For of His Almighty power He has given the most signal proof by creating and calling into being all things that exist in the heavens above and the earth beneath. *All the gods of the nations*, says the Psalmist, *are idols, but the Lord made the heavens* (Ps. xcvi. 5). *Thou, Lord God*, exclaims Jeremiah, *hast made the heaven and the earth by Thy great power and stretched-out arm, and there is nothing too hard for Thee* (Jer. xxxii. 17); and

[1] Bonitas in Latin, in Greek χρηστότης. See Rom. ii. 4; xi. 22; Tit. iii. 4. The Latin bonitas=

(i) *Natural goodness*, i.e. the good quality of a thing, e.g. *soli*, Caesar, *B. G.* i. 28; *vini*, Plin. xiv. 4. 6.

(ii) *Moral goodness*, i.e. the conformity of the free will with right reason, e.g. "eam potestatem bonitate retinebat," Corn. Nep. *Milt.* viii.

(iii) *Relative goodness*, i.e. active benevolence: comp. "bonitas et beneficentia," Cic. *N. D.* i. 43. 121; "facit parentes bonitas, non necessitas," Phaedr. iii. 15. 18. Comp. French bonté.

[2] As applied to God bonitas denotes *Constans Dei voluntas communicandi felicitatem suis creaturis, secundum conditionem earum, et consilia sapientiæ suæ.* Schouppe, *Elem. Theol. Dog.*, i. p. 297.

[3] Creator et conservator omnium tum visibilium tum invisibilium= ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων. Symb. Nic.

the song of the celestial host as heard by S. John is, *Thou art worthy, O Lord our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are and were created* (Apoc. iv. 11).

(*b*) *The Preserver*[1], Conservator.

But God is not only the Creator of all things, He is the sovereign, and preserves and upholds all things. His relation to the universe did not, as the Deists hold, cease at Creation. He is the "Vigor tenax rerum," and exercises an all-sustaining power, *upholding all things by the Word of His power* (Heb. i. 3)[2].

Part II.

The Doctrine of the Trinity in Unity.

ix. **The Trinity.** Having dealt with the essence and the attributes of God, the Article proceeds to deal with the doctrine of the Trinity[3], and states that "In Unity

[1] Conservator. The word is not uncommon as a divine epithet among classical writers, e.g. "Pro dei immortales, custodes et conservatores hujus urbis atque imperii." Cic. *Sest.* xxiv. 53. In inscriptions it occurs as an epithet of Jupiter. The preposition in composition has an intensifying force, and denotes *to keep thoroughly, to retain in existence, to uphold and preserve.* Hence God is *Omnitenens* as well as Omnipotens. See Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 214; Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 34, 35.

[2] Φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. Vulg. *portans*, O. L. *ferens* v. *gerens*. This present and continuous support and carrying forward to their end of all created things was attributed by Jewish writers to God no less than their creation. The action of God is in this passage referred to the Son: conf. Col. i. 17. He in the words of Œcumenius περιάγει καὶ συνέχει καὶ πηδαλιουχεῖ...τὰ ἀόρατα καὶ τὰ ὅρατα περιφέρων καὶ κυβερνῶν. See Barrow's *Sermons on the Creed*, vol. iv. p. 163; Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 37.

[3] The word "Trinity" does not occur in Scripture. It is first found in Theophilus of Antioch, A.D. 170. His Greek τριάς first occurs in its Latin equivalent in Tertullian. See *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 62, 3.

of this Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power, and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

x. **The word Person**[1], as applied to God, is inadequate, for it symbolizes that which transcends our experience and our comprehension. But, according to the definitions of the ancient Church, we acknowledge that in the one Divine Essence there are three Persons[2], inseparably united, co-equal in eternity and perfection.

xi. **The Evidence of the Old Testament.** Intimations that "the Name of the One God, when written out in full, is a threefold Name," are traceable in the Old Testament:—Thus

(i) At the Creation of Man we hear God saying, *Let* US *make man in* OUR *image, after* OUR *likeness* (Gen. i. 26), and yet in the following verse we read, *And God created man in* HIS *own image* (Gen. i. 27).

(ii) After the Fall we hear God saying, *Behold, the man is become as one of* US (Gen. iii. 22); while, when He reveals Himself to Moses at the

[1] Persona (fr. personare=*to sound through*) denotes
(i) *A mask*, i.e. that through which the sound of the voice passes;
(ii) *A character represented by an actor;*
(iii) *An individual person.*
The use of the term by the Latins was regarded with suspicion by the Greeks on account of its equivocal meaning, while the Latins were alike suspicious of the Greek ὑπόστασις, which they could only translate by *substantia*, as suggesting that the three Persons had not the same Essence. Since, however, the Council of Alexandria, A.D. 362, at which the matter was discussed, Persona and ὑπόστασις have generally been accepted as equivalent. See *Introd. to the Creeds*, p. 49, n. 3.

[2] Or *Hypostases.* "The word ὑπόστασις was a metaphysical word, for which we have no exact equivalent. Having originally meant the sediment at the bottom of a fluid, it came to mean the substratum or ground of qualities, and so a person, that is, the underlying reality upon which various characters and experiences are based." Strong's *Manual of Theology*, p. 183.

burning bush, He bids him tell the people, I AM *hath sent Me unto you* (Ex. iii. 14);

(iii) The Psalmist says, *The Lord said unto my Lord; Sit Thou at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool* (Ps. cx. 1);

(iv) In the vision of Isaiah the Seraphim cry one unto another, *Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory* (Isai. vi. 3).

Here, however mysteriously, we have a foreshadowing of a plurality in the Godhead[1], intimations that the one Personal God is a Living Monad[2], at the same time "Tres et Unus[3]," a Divine Three.

xii. **The Evidence of the New Testament.** The obscure intimations, however, of the Old Testament become express revelations in the New. Thus

(α) The account of our Lord's Baptism reveals to us the Son baptized, the Father acknowledging Him from heaven, the Holy Ghost descending upon Him in the form of a dove (Matt. iii. 16, 17);

(β) Again, while our Lord expressly declares Himself to be one with the Father[4] (John x. 30), He yet says, *I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth* (John xiv. 16, 17);

[1] Comp. the threefold priestly benediction under the Jewish Law, Numb. vi. 24—26, with the counterpart benediction of 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

[2] "More really one even than an individual man is one." Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, p. 121.

[3] "Unus," not merely "unum." This may be called the keynote of the Athanasian Creed.

[4] Ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν, *I and the Father are one.* "Every word in this pregnant clause is full of meaning. It is *I*, not *the Son; the Father*, not *my Father;* one essence (ἕν Vulg. *unum*), not one person (εἷς Gal. iii. 28, *unus*); *are* not *am*." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

(γ) But with still greater clearness, when He gives His Apostles their last commission, He commands them to *go into all the world, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the Name*[1] *of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost* (Matt. xxviii. 19)[2].

Thus the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity is taught us not primarily and originally by any Apostolic teacher, or any Apostolic Council, but by our Lord Himself.

xiii. **The Unity of the Godhead.** The Three Persons of the Trinity have, as we have seen[3], a common Divine Nature, which is numerically One[4], as our Lord Himself says, *I and the Father are one*[5] (John x. 30). This Unity of the Godhead the Article upholds, when it asserts that the Three Persons are "of the same essence, power, and eternity," in other words, that each is God, and each expresses the whole fulness of the Godhead with all His Attributes[6]. For the Catholic doctrine is that,

(1) The Father is the One Eternal Personal God,

(2) The Son is the One Eternal Personal God,

(3) The Spirit is the One Eternal Personal God.

[1] Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, not ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. "By choosing without repetition to say 'the Name,' He teaches that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are One. The revelation of each of the Three is the revelation of the other Two. They cannot be known apart." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 44.

[2] S. Paul's final benediction to the Corinthians is a commemoration of *our Lord Jesus Christ, God, and the Holy Ghost* (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

[3] See above, p. 39.

[4] *Numerically*, not *collectively*. A collective Unity is a Union and therefore a Composition of Parts. This latter the attribute of Simplicity excludes from God.

[5] "Absolute Pater Deus et Filius Deus Unum sunt, non Unione Personæ, sed Substantiæ Unitate." S. Hilar., *De Trin.*, cap. iv.

[6] See Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, p. 133. "To each person in one passage or other of the New Testament are ascribed the same titles and works; each is acknowledged as Lord; each is eternal;...each is Creator; each wills with a supreme will; each is the Author of the new birth;... what is all this but the Father Eternal, the Son Eternal, and the Holy Ghost Eternal; the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost Omnipotent; the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost God"? Comp. the Athanasian Creed.

Each Person possesses all the Divine attributes, which are inherent in the Divine Essence. Each, in the language of the Athanasian Creed, is Uncreate; each is Infinite; each is Eternal; each is Almighty; each is God; each is Lord.

xiv. **The Characteristics of the Three Persons.** In speaking, indeed, of the Three Persons we are wont to speak of the Father as the first, the Son as the second, and the Holy Ghost as the third Person in the Trinity. We use this language, not because one Person is "afore or after other," either prior or posterior in time, either superior or inferior in rank, but because there is in the Godhead a certain order of source or origin. Thus it is the property or characteristic

(i) *Of the Father,*

to be unbegotten, the Fountain and Source of being[1];

(ii) *Of the Son,*

to be begotten of the Father[2];

(iii) *Of the Holy Ghost,*

to proceed[3],

[1] Πηγὴ Θεότητος; Ἀρχή; Αἰτία; Principium; "Totius Divinitatis, vel, si melius dicitur, Deitatis, principium Pater est." S. Aug. *de Trin.* iv. 20. Comp. *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 65, 66, 209. "'Pater est Vita in Semetipso non a Filio,' as S. Augustine says in another place; He is above time and beyond space, His own law, His own sufficiency, His own centre, His own end." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 21. Hooker, *E. P.* i. ii. 2.

[2] "Filius est Vita in Semetipso sed a Patre." "He is of the Father alone, neither made, nor created, *but* begotten." Athan. Creed. "What the Father is, He is from None. What the Son is, He is from Him, being the Eternal Son of an Eternal Father." See Pearson on *The Creed*, pp. 62, 63; Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.*, v. 51. 1. Πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατήρ, τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἐστι, πλὴν τῆς αἰτίας· πάντα δὲ ὅσα τοῦ Υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος, πλὴν τῆς υἱότητος, καὶ τῶν ὅσα σωματικῶς περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγεται. S. Greg. Nazianz., *Orat.* xxxiv. 10.

[3] Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens. Athan. Symb.

but while there is this order of source or origin, whereby One Person may be, not before the other, but from the other, all the three Persons are equally God and equally Lord, for the whole perfection of the Divine Nature is in each[1].

[1] "The Catholic dogma may be said to be summed up in the formula on which St Augustine lays so much stress, "Tres et Unus" not merely "Unum"; hence it is the key-note, as it may be called, of the Athanasian Creed. In that Creed we testify to the Unus Increatus, to the Unus Immensus, Omnipotens, Deus, and Dominus; yet each of the Three also is by Himself Increatus, Immensus, Omnipotens, for Each is that One GOD, though Each is not the Other; Each, as is intimated by Unus Increatus, is the One Personal GOD of Natural Religion." Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, p. 121.

ARTICLE II.

1563.	1571.
Verbum Dei uerum hominem esse factum.	*Of the worde or sonne of God which was made very man.*
Filius, qui est uerbum Patris, ab æterno à patre genitus uerus et æternus Deus, ac Patri consubstantialis, in utero Beatæ uirginis ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit: ita ut duæ naturæ, diuina et humana, integrè atque perfectè in unitate personæ, fuerint inseparabiliter coniunctæ: ex quibus est vnus CHRISTVS, verus Deus et verus Homo: qui uerè passus est, crucifixus, mortuus, et sepultus, ut Patrem nobis reconciliaret, essetque hostia non tantùm pro culpa originis, uerum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis.	The Sonne, which is the worde of the Father, begotten from euerlastyng of the Father, the very and eternall GOD, of one substaunce with the father, toke man's nature in the wombe of the blessed Virgin, of her substaunce: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say the Godhead and manhood, were ioyned together in one person, neuer to be diuided, whereof is one Christe, very GOD and very man, who truely suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his father to vs, and to be a sacrifice, not only for originall gylt, but also for all actuall sinnes of men.

i. **Connection.** The subject of the Incarnation naturally follows that of the Blessed Trinity. God, being such as the first Article has stated Him to be, has supplemented His original act of Creation by the manifestation of Himself in human form. The second Article, therefore, proceeds to treat of the nature and purpose of the Self-manifestation of the Son of God by taking upon Him human flesh.

ii. **Title.** In the Edition of 1553 the Title of the Article both in Latin and English varied from the present English form, and ran as follows, "Verbum Dei verum

hominem esse factum," "That the Worde or Sonne of God was made a very man." The authoritative Latin edition of 1571 has "De Verbo, sive Filio Dei qui verus homo factus est," "Of the Worde or Sonne of God which was made very Man."

iii. **Source.** The Article, as originally drafted, and as it appeared in the Latin and English editions of 1553, lacked the clauses stating the Eternal generation of the Son and His consubstantiality with the Father. In its earliest form it had constituted, with very slight variation, a portion of the Third Article of the Thirteen of 1538, which was identical with the Third Article of the Augsburg Confession. The additional clauses were introduced in 1563 from the Würtemberg Confession of 1552[1].

iv. **Object.** The Article was not directed against the Mediæval party, for they held the orthodox doctrine respecting the Deity of the Son and His Incarnation. It is rather aimed against the ancient Docetic teaching revived by the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century. They denied altogether that Christ was "born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh[2]," and amidst many other tenets that savoured of Arianism, rejected the doctrine of the Universality of Christ's redemption[3].

[1] This Confession was a Lutheran Manifesto based very largely upon the Augsburg Confession. It was presented to the Council of Trent by the ambassadors of Würtemberg. The Article *de Filio Dei* agrees verbatim with the clauses inserted in this Article in 1563; "Credimus et confitemur Filium Dei, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, *ab æterno a Patre suo genitum, verum et æternum Deum, Patri suo consubstantialem.*" Hardwick, *Hist. of the Articles*, p. 127.

[2] "The chief opponents of Christ's Divinity," we read in one of the Zurich letters dated Aug. 14, 1551, "are the Arians, who are now beginning to shake our Churches with greater violence than ever, as they deny the conception of Christ by the Virgin." Hardwick, p. 90. Hooper, writing to Bullinger, June 25, 1549, says, "The Anabaptists....deny altogether that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary according to the flesh."

[3] A work published in 1556 tells of one condemned for holding "that Christ was only incarnate and suffered death for them that died before His Incarnation, and not for them that died since." Hardwick, pp. 89, 90.

v. **Analysis.** The Article treats of the following points:—

(1) The Deity of the Son of God;

(2) His Incarnation;

(3) The Union in Him of the two Natures, the Divine and Human;

(4) The Fact of the Passion;

(5) The Object of the Passion.

(*a*) *The Deity of the Son of God.*

vi. **The statements** of the Article on this point are fourfold. It speaks of the Son (i) as *the Word of the Father*; (ii) as *begotten from everlasting of the Father*; (iii) as *Very and Eternal God*; and (iv) as *consubstantial with the Father.*

vii. **The Word of the Father.** In Scripture the application of this term to the Son is confined to the writings of S. John. *In the beginning*, we read, *was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God* (John i. 1)[1]; and the message of the same Apostle in his Epistle is, *That which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life*[2] (1 John i. 1). The term Word, or Logos, marks the inseparable inherence of the Son in

[1] Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος, καὶ ὁ Λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ Λόγος. The idea of Logos or Wisdom is dimly traceable in the Old Testament (Gen. i. 3, 6, 9; Ps. xxxiii. 6; Prov. viii., ix.); becomes more clear in the Apocrypha (Ecclus. i. 1—20; xxiv. 1—22; Wisdom vi. 22 sqq.; ix. 17, 18), and clearer still in the Targums and the writings of Philo. In the Targums or Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament, we read in Gen. iii. 8, instead of "they heard the Voice of the Lord God," they heard "the Voice of the Word (*Memra*) of the Lord God"; again in Gen. iii. 9, instead of "God called unto Adam," we read "the word (*Memra*) of the Lord called unto Adam." In the writings of Philo the Logos was an intermediate agency between the Creator and the creature.

[2] "S. John taking the expression the Word, on which human reason had lighted in its gropings, stripped it of its merely philosophical and mythological wrappings, and fixed it as the Divine Word by identifying it with the Person of Christ." See Bp Westcott's *Com. on John* i. 1.

the Unity of the Godhead. It defines the fact that the Son is the Mediator between the Creator and the creature, the Person by whom the Father is naturally and properly revealed. Hence Scripture tells us that by Him God *made the worlds* (Heb. i. 2), that *in Him all created being subsists* (Col. i. 17)[1], and that through Him God spake to man at *the end of these days* (Heb. i. 2).

viii. **Begotten from everlasting of the Father.** But He, the Word, was none other than the Son of God, begotten from everlasting of the Father. Pre-existent from all eternity[2], He stands in a relation wholly peculiar to the Father. He is God's *own proper Son*[3], the only One to whom the title belongs, and that in a sense in which it could be applied to no other. He is Μονογενής, *only-begotten* (John i. 18), and as such, His generation is unique, being "before all worlds," not in time, but in eternity. We cannot fathom that which is unfathomable, a property of the Divine Nature, known only to God and to His Son. All that we can dare to say is that though this relationship is, in its deepest essence, incomprehensible for the finite understanding, as indeed is impressed upon us by our Lord

[1] Intimation of this is found in the expression *God said* (Gen. i. 3, 6, 9). Ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων τὰ πάντα πεποίηκε διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου Λόγου τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. S. Athan. *de Incarn.* iii. 3. As such the Son is πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Col. i. 15), the Λόγος προφορικός (Theoph. *ad Autolyc.* ii. 22), the ἰδέα καὶ ἐνέργεια of Creation (Athenag. *pro Christ.* § 10). Comp. Heb. i. 3, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

[2] Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ Λόγος (S. John i. 1). Ἐν ἀρχῇ expresses not *at the time of Creation*, but in Eternity, before there was such a thing as time at all.

[3] Hence S. Paul says τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο (Rom. viii. 32); and our Lord could speak of God as His own "proper Father," πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν (John v. 18). "We are apt to say at first hearing that He is God, though He is the Son of God, marvelling at the mystery. But what to man is a mystery, to God is a cause. He is God, not *though*, but *because* He *is the Son of God*." Newman. *Parochial Sermons*, vi. 57. The Arians made great efforts to avoid acknowledging the proper Sonship of the Word, arguing that He was a Κτίσμα, after His creation made to be Son, instrumental in the creation of all else than Himself. Thus they admitted that He existed before time, but asserted that ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, "there was when He was not."

Himself[1], yet we must believe that the Infinite could not be the perfectly Blessed One, without an eternal and perfect object of His Love[2]. And this object He has in His Son, who, while He must necessarily be *another* than the Father, yet has continually the ground of His existence in the being and essence of the Father, and is not *a* Son of God, but *the* Son of God, His *beloved Son, in Whom* He is ever *well pleased* (Matt. iii. 17)[3].

ix. **Very and Eternal God.** Since the Word is in a proper and yet unique sense, Son of God, He is not another God, a sort of under-God, but "very and Eternal God." Scripture is clear as to the Deity of the Son. S. John distinctly says, *the Word was God* (John i. 1), and S. Paul tells us that *in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily* (Col. ii. 9)[4], and that He is from all eternity *in the essential form of God* (Phil. ii. 6)[5]. Moreover he speaks of Him as *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ* (Tit. ii. 13)[6], as *over all, God blessed for ever* (Rom. ix. 5). Indirect

[1] Matt. xi. 27, *οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱόν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ· οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει, εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱός. Nemo novit Filium nisi Pater, neque Patrem quis novit nisi Filius.* Vulg. Ἐπιγινώσκει, as distinguished from the simple verb, implies a perfect and thorough knowledge. Comp. Luke i. 4, and Bp Lightfoot on Col. i. 9. There is a remarkable affinity between this verse and the general import of the Gospel according to S. John. It brings out an absolute and unique mystery of spiritual community, both in reference to power and to knowledge, between the Father and the Son. See Lange *in loc.*, and compare Luke x. 21, 22.

[2] Oosterzee's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 275.

[3] *Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα. Filius Meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui.* Vulg.

[4] Ἐν *αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς Θεότητος σωματικῶς* (Col. ii. 9). His is not Θειοτής, Divinity, or the possession of Godlike properties, such as Spirituality, but Θεότης, *Deity*, or the possession of *the nature of God*. He is *perfectus Deus*, and not the less such, because whether in virtue of the order of origin, or in virtue of His human nature, He is subordinate to the Father, "æqualis Patri secundum Divinitatem, minor Patre secundum Humanitatem." Athanasian Creed.

[5] Ἐν *μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων*. Μορφή expresses essential being, as distinct from σχῆμα (Lat. *habitus*), which is mere external shape. Μορφή is the *forma*, σχῆμα is the *figura formæ*. The verb ὑπάρχων expresses that He was *originally* in the form of God. See Bp Lightfoot *in loc.*

[6] Τοῦ *μεγάλου Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. That one and the same Person is intended in this

testimony to the same effect is afforded by the ascription to the Son of the same attributes as to the Father, the same power (John v. 21), the same knowledge (John xxi. 17), the same wisdom (Luke xi. 49), the same immortality (Heb. xiii. 8). Moreover He performs the same works as the Father; He forgives sins (Matt. ix. 2 sq.); He quickens and judges men (John v. 24—29). He claims the same honour as is rendered to the Father (John v. 23; xiv. 1), and He allows the homage due to God to be paid to Himself (John xx. 28).

x. **Consubstantial with the Father.** Moreover, as very and eternal God, He is of one substance with the Father. He is ὁμοούσιος[1], of one and the same essence with the Father. This famous term, of which "consubstantial" is the English equivalent, is not found in Scripture, but acquired an important dogmatic meaning owing to the exigencies of the Arian controversy. God as the I AM, has an essence. The Son, if He be God, and no mere creature, is of the essence of the Father, and the term ὁμοούσιος is a perfectly natural statement of the relation between the Father and the Son. The Arians were willing to exalt Him to any conceivable height short of Godhead[2], but in so doing they parted Him from the Divine essence by a fathomless chasm, and really placed between God and the creature a subordinate God. The Nicene Fathers, therefore, proclaimed in unmistakeable terms the real and proper Godhead of the Son, and laid it down that He was not of a *different* nature from the Father, as are all things

phrase is made quite clear by the use of the one article. Supposing the writer to designate one Person as μεγάλου Θεοῦ and another Person as Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, the article would have been repeated before Σωτῆρος. "We have here," writes Bp Ellicott, "a direct, definite, and even studied declaration of Christ's Divinity." See Ellicott *in loc.*

[1] On the word ὁμοούσιος, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 84, *n.* 1, and the references there given.

[2] See Dean Church's *Sermon on the Incarnation*, S. P. C. K. Series, i. p. 138.

visible and invisible, whereof He is the Maker; nor of a merely *similar* nature and essence, ὁμοιούσιος, as one man resembles another without identity; but that He is of *one and the same nature, essence, and substance,* ὁμοούσιος with the Father, God Himself in all His perfection and completeness, *blessed for evermore* (Rom. ix. 5)[1].

(*b*) *The Incarnation of the Son of God.*

xi. **The Incarnation.** Having stated that the Word is consubstantial with the Father, the Article proceeds to treat of His consubstantiality with man, or His Incarnation. Respecting this unspeakable mystery it affirms that the ever blessed Son of God "took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance." The Article thus agrees with the statements of the Creeds. For whereas the Apostles' Creed affirms that He, Who was with the Father before all worlds, "was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary"; and the Nicene Creed expands this by stating that He was "incarnate by the Holy Ghost...and was made man"; and the Athanasian Creed declares that "our Lord Jesus Christ,...God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds," became "Man, of the substance of His mother, born in the world," the Article gathers together these statements into one whole, and places before us in terms at once accurate and distinct the mighty mystery of the Incarnation.

[1] "Between the Son and the Father there exists unceasingly the most intimate *community* of life and love. This lies in the nature of the case, and is besides constantly asserted by the Son Himself. *The Father loveth the Son, and sheweth Him all things that Himself doeth* (John v. 20). The Father *honoureth the Son* (John viii. 54), and *hath delivered all things unto Him* (Matt. xi. 27). The Son, on the other hand, *doeth* all things whatsoever the Father doeth (John v. 19), and is in heaven with the Father while He holds converse with men on earth (John iii. 13). Without any limitation, therefore, He is able to speak of all that is the Father's as at the same time His (John xvii. 10), and thus Himself justifies us in speaking of a true oneness of nature (ὁμοουσία) between Him and the Father." Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 277, 278.

xii. **Foreshadowings of the Incarnation.** This stupendous event had long been foretold and foreshadowed[1]. The Eternal Word in frequent Theophanies had presented Himself to the vision of Patriarchs and Prophets. He had imaged Himself beforehand in elect sons of men under the Old Covenant[2], and in them had realised, long before He appeared, some features of the Being, Whose entire Divine and human fulness He purposed to express in the revelation of Himself, as at once the Son of God and the Son of Man. But since the taint and corruption of our nature descends to all men, who are born in the ordinary course of the offspring of Adam, it was not possible that He could be conceived like other men. Accordingly the Spirit[3], who in the beginning brooded over the waters, and awoke order out of chaos and life out of death (Gen. i. 2), brought it about by the exercise of Divine Power that in *the fulness of time* (Gal. iv. 4) the Virgin Mary should, without the intervention of any human father whatever, become in time the mother of Him Who was with the Father from all eternity. In meek submission to the Divine will she humbly accepted the supernatural dignity in store for her, and gave herself up to be the instrument of the Divine counsel, saying to the angel Gabriel, *Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to thy word* (Luke i. 38).

xiii. **The Fulfilment.** Thus it came to pass that He, Who is very God, condescended to be "conceived by the Holy Ghost," and so far from "abhorring the Virgin's womb," deigned to take unto Him "of her substance" the simplest original element of man's nature, before it came to

[1] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 97, 98.

[2] See Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 238; Westcott's *Study of the Gospels*, p. 153; Liddon's *University Sermons*, i. p. 197.

[3] Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σε, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι (Luke i. 35).

have any personal human subsistence[1]. Moreover, passing through all the stages necessary to maturity, He was born into this our world of the Virgin Mary, even as other children are born, at Bethlehem of Judah in the reign of the Roman Emperor Augustus (Luke ii. 6, 7). Thus "in great humility" He willed[2] to be conceived and take upon Him our nature, and so the new Adam was formed, not as the first Adam out of the dust of the ground, lest He should miss the participation with us in a common nature, but from a woman, of the substance of the Virgin Mary His mother, that as her seed He might "bruise the serpent's head."

(*c*) *The Union of the two Natures.*

xiv. **The Effect** of this infinite condescension on His part, of this conjunction of the Divine with the human, is stated in the Article to have been this, that

(α) "Two whole and perfect Natures, that is to say, the Godhead and Manhood, were joined together in one Person, never to be divided[3]";

(β) "Whereof[4] is one Christ, very God, and very Man."

For in taking upon Him man's nature the second Person in the Trinity lost nothing of His essentially Divine attributes[5], and while the Manhood He assumed did not

[1] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 53. 3.

[2] "Opportunitate temporis, quando voluit, quando sciebat, tunc natus est; non enim nolens natus est. Nemo nostrum quia vult nascitur, et nemo nostrum quando vult moritur. Ille quando voluit natus est." S. Aug. *Serm. ad Catech.* c. viii.

[3] The two Natures were in the language of the Article joined together (1) integrè, (2) perfectè, and (3) inseparabiliter in unitate Personæ. See Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 52 and 53; Pearson *on the Creed*, i. 289, Art. 3.

[4] Whereof = *ex quibus*, i.e. of which two whole and perfect Natures.

[5] "Nunquam destitit esse Deus." S. Leo, *Serm. in Nativ.* 26, c. 2. "Assumpsit quod non erat, et permansit quod erat." Aug. *Serm.* 184. 1. "Ver-

lessen the form of God, the form of God did not annihilate His Humanity. "He was, in the flesh, as before the Incarnation, in the bosom of the Father[1]." Hence by this union a Personality appeared in this our world, in which the Divine just as little existed without the human, as the human without the Divine, "One Christ," true God and true Man. Both natures, though originally by no means identical, became in consequence of this personal union henceforth inseparably joined together[2], and that not by any blending or confusion of the Divine and human essence, or any conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by His "taking the Manhood into God," and as the rational soul and flesh constitute one man[3], so God and man is one Christ. And the two natures thus united are not only real but complete. Our Lord, as born of the Virgin Mary, was not an emanation from God, or a Being *all but God*, He was God Himself, in all His Perfection and Completeness. But He was also perfect Man. No one element or faculty of human nature was wanting to the Manhood which He assumed. He had a body; He had a soul; He had a spirit; and the two natures were perfectly and inseparably united[4]. The

bum igitur Dei Deus, Filius Dei... factus est homo; ita se ad susceptionem humilitatis nostræ sine diminutione suæ majestatis inclinans, ut manens quod erat, assumensque quod non erat, veram servi formam ei formæ, in qua Deo Patri est æqualis, uniret, et tanto fœdere naturam utramque consereret, ut nec inferiorem consumeret glorificatio, nec superiorem minueret assumptio." S. Leo, *Serm. in Solem. Nativ.* 20, c. 2.

[1] Strong's *Manual of Theology*, p. 279.

[2] "This blessed union is incapable of dissolution. As there ever has been, and ever will be, the eternal Son of God, so will there ever remain the eternal Son of Man." Archer Butler's *Sermons*, Series i. p. 73.

[3] "Unus autem non conversione Divinitatis in carnem, sed assumptione Humanitatis in Deum." The words of the Athanasian Creed "unus omnino," rendered in a Prymer of 1543, "utterly one," denote an absolute, entire, oneness. On the Arian, Apollinarian, Nestorian, and Eutychian heresies as regards the Incarnation, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 106, 107.

[4] "To the question who is the 'I' who presents Himself as speaking in the Gospel? we cannot reply Only the Man Jesus, or Only the Son of God; but the God-man in undivided person-

manner of this union is to our finite understanding incomprehensible. It is the mystery of mysteries, the one everlasting mystery of Divine power and love. But we cannot be surprised at its baffling our comprehension. "The highest miracle in the world's history will assuredly be the last of all to be understood[1]."

(*d*) *The Fact of the Passion.*

xv. **Who truly suffered.** Having declared that the Eternal Son of God thus became Man, the Article proceeds to enunciate the truth that He still further humbled Himself even unto death, that He *truly* suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried. Here again the statement made sums up the teaching of the Creeds. For while the Athanasian Formula simply asserts that He "suffered," and the Nicene affirms that He "was crucified under Pontius Pilate,...suffered, and was buried," and the Apostles' Creed adds that "He died," the Article brings out strongly the fact that His Passion and death were *real and actual*[2] and not in appearance only. It was not unimportant to insist on this, for many of the Anabaptist School in the sixteenth century had revived the erroneous teaching of the Docetæ, and represented the Death of our Redeemer as having been apparent only and not real. In respect to this idea, which has been revived in modern times, it is to be

ality. Hence the Lord never says 'I and the Logos,' or 'I and the Son,' but 'I and the Father are one thing'; for this 'I' is the Son Himself, who is inseparably one with Jesus of Nazareth." Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 513. "Videmus duplicem statum, non confusum, sed conjunctum in una persona, Deum et hominem Jesum...et...salva est utriusque proprietas substantiæ." Tertullian, *adv. Prax.* 27. "Ad rependendum nostræ conditionis debitum natura inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili, Deusque verus et homo verus in unitatem Domini temperatur, ut quod nostris remediis congruebat, unus atque idem Dei hominisque Mediator, et mori posset ex uno, et resurgere posset ex altero." S. Leo, *In Sol. Nat.* 20, c. 2.

[1] Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 516.

[2] *Vere* passus est, crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus.

observed that on purely historical grounds there is no single reason for doubting the reality of His Death. On the contrary

(α) Our Lord's words before the event imply it[1];

(β) Friends like the Holy Women[2], Joseph of Arimathæa[3], Nicodemus[4], and the Apostles[5], were certain of it;

(γ) Foes as (1) the soldier who thrust the head of his spear into His side[6]; (2) Pilate who examined the centurion as to the reality of the death[7]; (3) the Jewish Sanhedrim, who begged that His grave might be carefully guarded, were convinced of it[8];

(δ) The narrative of the Evangelists, the dogmatic statements of the Epistles[9], the distinct assertion of the glorified Lord after the Ascension[10], assume it without hesitation;

(ε) The clear statement of the historian Tacitus[11] records it as an historical fact, and not only

[1] Luke xxiii. 46, *Father, into Thy Hands I commend My Spirit; and having said this, He gave up the ghost.* These words imply that His Spirit was separated from His body, and, as death consists in this separation, so far as He was man, He died.

[2] Mark xv. 47.

[3] Mark xv. 43.

[4] John xix. 39.

[5] Acts ii. 23.

[6] John xix. 31—37. The spear used is called λόγχη, Vulg. *lancea*. It was either (1) the Roman *hasta*, the iron head of which was the width of a hand-breadth and pointed at the end, or (2) the long lance of a horseman.

[7] Mark xv. 44.

[8] Matt. xxvii. 62—66.

[9] Rom. iv. 24, 25; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 24.

[10] Apoc. i. 18.

[11] "Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per procuratorem Pontium Pilatum, supplicio affectus erat." Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44. *Supplicio affectus erat* denotes that He *suffered the capital penalty*. "It is true that according to the Gospel History Pilate *took Jesus and scourged Him* (John xix. 1), and in this sense punished Him or caused Him to suffer; but this would have been a trifle to the mind of a Roman historian, not worthy of being recorded; the only ground for referring to Christ would be that under Pontius Pilate His life and labours came to an end." Bp Goodwin's *Foundations of the Creed*, p. 151.

was it accepted in an age which had its archives and its registers, but it is mentioned by later authors as a matter of common notoriety, and, besides being never disproved, gave point to the opprobrious epithets of remorseless foes[1].

(*e*) *The Object of the Passion.*

xvi. **Its twofold Nature.** Having asserted that the Passion of our Lord was a real objective fact, the Article proceeds to deal with its object and purpose. The Nicene and Athanasian symbols affirm that "He suffered for us and for our salvation." The Article amplifies this statement and affirms that our Lord humbled Himself to the death of the Cross

(1) "That He might reconcile His Father to us";

(2) "That He might be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men."

It thus emphasizes two of the three figures, under which Scripture represents to us the purpose of the Passion, (1) *Reconciliation* or *At-one-ment*; (2) *Propitiation* or *Sacrifice.*

xvii. **Reconciliation.** The idea which lies at the root of the Greek word καταλλαγή[2], which we have rendered by Reconciliation or At-one-ment, is that of bringing together those who have been at variance. Now in consequence of

[1] "Patibulo affixus interiit...crucis supplicio interemptum et Deum fuisse contenditis." Arnob. *Adv. Gentes*, t. xxvi. 40. "How could He have gone through the Crucifixion without dying? What would have been His physical condition, even if a spark of life had remained? If He did not die then, when did He die? Did He and the Apostles agree to pretend that He had died? Why should men make up a story, which was to bring them no benefit, but only contempt, persecution, and death?" Fisher's *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, p. 167.

[2] For καταλλαγή, Vulg. *reconciliatio*, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 133, *n.* 2.

the Fall man is not only in a state of bondage, but also in one of alienation from God, and S. Paul speaks of *the wrath of God being revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness* (Rom. i. 18)[1]. One of the purposes, then, of our Lord's Passion was in our nature and for us to do that which we could not do ourselves, and make peace between man and God. When, therefore, He offered Himself on the Altar of His Cross, He died for all, and all died in Him[2], and so He abolished in His flesh the enmity which sin had interposed between the creature and the Creator. Hence S. Paul affirms that in Christ God reconciled man[3], the world[4], and all things[5] to Himself. Here, as in other places, Holy Scripture speaks of the sinner as reconciled to God, not of God as reconciled to the sinner. Still the language of the Article holds good. For while the essential nature of God is unchangeable Love, it is also and equally unchangeable Righteousness, and the fact of sin in man had disturbed the relations of God towards man. If, then, reunion was to be brought about and an at-one-ment rendered possible, the righteous anger of God against sin must be satisfied. And it was satisfied, when the Son of God, having in our nature lived a life of perfect obedience, offered up that unblemished life

[1] Τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων. Κατέχειν = (1) *to hold firmly*, comp. Luke viii. 15, ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν; (2) *to hold down, restrain, hinder*; comp. Gen. xxiv. 56, LXX. μὴ κατέχετέ με; Luke iv. 42, κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. The latter, says Dr Vaughan, appears the sense here—*who hinder, hold down, the truth by living in unrighteousness.*

[2] Εἷς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον (2 Cor. v. 15), *we thus judge that one died for all, therefore all died* (*in Him*). See a striking sermon of F. W. Robertson on this verse.

[3] Ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ, 2 Cor. v. 18.

[4] Θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, 2 Cor. v. 19.

[5] Ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησε πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν, Col. i. 19, 20. Observe the compound form here used ἀποκαταλλάξαι = *to restore* or *reconcile completely*. See Bp Lightfoot's *note in loc.*

upon His Cross[1], and thus reconciled man to God and God to man.

xviii. **A Sacrifice.** Besides bringing about this Reconciliation, the Article further affirms that the object of our Lord's Passion was that He might be a Victim and a Sacrifice "not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men[2]." On this subject the language of Holy Scripture is explicit: for

(*a*) It was expressly said to Joseph by the Angel, *Thou shalt call His Name Jesus, for He*[3] *shall save His people from their sins* (Matt. i. 21);

(*b*) Again John the Baptist expressly pointed Him out as *the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world* (John i. 29);

(*c*) And the Apostle John writes, *If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins* (1 John ii. 1, 2).

As the appointed Victim, destined in the eternal purpose[4] to be the sacrifice for sin, He became by His death the propitiation not only for original sin[5], but also for all

[1] When our Lord suffered on the Cross, our nature suffered in Him, for all Humanity was represented by Him and gathered up in Him. In Him our nature satisfied its old and heavy debt, for the presence of His Divinity gave it transcendent merit. "Dignitas carnis Christi non est æstimanda solum secundum carnis naturam, sed secundum personam assumentem, in quantum scilicet erat caro Dei ex quo habebat dignitatem infinitam." S. Thom. Aq. *Sum.* iii. 48. 2. "That which setteth the high price on this sacrifice, is this; that He which offereth it unto God, is God." Bp Andrewes, *Serm.* ii. 152. "There was a virtue in His death which there could be in no other, for He was God." Newman, *Paroch. Serm.* vi. 71.

[2] Or as it is rendered in 1553 "to be a Sacrifice for all sinne of manne, both originall, and actuall." "The omission of the important word 'all' in many modern copies of the Article is without the least authority. It appears in the editions of 1628, but is dropped as early as 1630, and deliberately in the received text of the Assembly of Divines, 1643." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 290, *n.*

[3] Αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει. "Αὐτὸς, casu recto, semper habet emphasin, hic maximam." Bengel.

[4] Comp. Apoc. xiii. 8, τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

[5] The guilt of original sin is cancel-

actual sins of men. That His propitiation is valid for all alike[1], and extends as far as the need of it through all place and all time[2], is clear from

(α) S. Peter's words to those who had been guilty of the awful crime[3] of crucifying the Lord of glory, *Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission of your sins* (Acts ii. 38);

(β) The words of Ananias to the repentant persecutor, *Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins* (Acts xxii. 16);

(γ) The words of S. Paul respecting the Corinthians, some of whom had been stained with the foulest vices and the deadliest sins, *Such were some of you, but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and in the Spirit of our God* (1 Cor. vi. 11);

(δ) The words of S. John, who, after saying that *Jesus Christ the righteous is the propitiation for our sins*, adds, *And not for ours only, but also for the whole world* (1 John ii. 1, 2).

led in Holy Baptism, when being made one with Christ (Rom. vi. 3), we share the virtue of His death for the sins of the whole world, and of His glorified Humanity in heaven.

[1] See Westcott on 1 John ii. 2.

[2] Comp. Justin, *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 95, τὸν ἑαυτοῦ Χριστὸν...ὁ Πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων τὰς πάντων κατάρας ἀναδέξασθαι ἐβουλήθη; S. Athan. *De Incarn.* viii. 4, Ἀντὶ πάντων αὐτὸ (σῶμα) θανάτῳ παραδιδούς; S. Aug. *In Psalm.* xci. 13, "Totum (orbem terrarum) judicare habet (Christus), quia pro toto pretium dedit." When, as in Matt. xx. 28; Rom. v. 19; Heb. ix. 28, the Passion is referred to as endured for "many," the word *many* is a quantitative designation of *all*, used for the purpose of contrast. See Vaughan and Westcott, *in loc.*, and Macaire, *Theol. Dogm.* ii. p. 180, French Tr.

[3] "Dic immane aliquid quod commisisti, grave, horrendum, quod etiam cogitare horres; quidquid vis feceris, numquid Christum occidisti? Non est isto facto aliquid pejus....Quantum nefas est occidere Christum? Judæi tamen Eum occiderunt, et postea... dimissum est illis peccatum quod commiserunt." S. Aug. *Serm. ad Cat.* xv. See below, p. 366, for the teaching of Catharinus as to the inefficacy of the Passion for all actual sins of men.

Article III.

1563.	1571.
De descensu Christi ad Inferos.	*Of the goyng downe of Christe into hell.*
Qvemmadmodum Christus pro nobis mortuus est et sepultus, ita est etiam credendus ad Inferos descendisse.	As Christe dyed for vs, and was buryed: so also it is to be beleued that he went downe into hell.

i. **Connection.** The third Article carries on the subject treated of in the second, and assures us that as Christ died and was buried, so also it is to be believed that He went down into the place of departed spirits. This, however, is an event in the economy of redemption, which so far differs from the above mentioned events, as it lies out of the range of human experience, and is, therefore, rather a deduction from them than an historical event coordinate with them.

ii. **Language and History.** As it stands at present, the Article consists only of a single sentence stating simply the fact of our Lord's descent into Hades. Herein it differs very considerably from the draft of 1553. Then the Article consisted of two clauses of the which the latter ran as follows:—"For the bodie laye in the sepulchre, untill the resurrection; but his Ghoste departing from hym, was with the ghostes that were in prison or in Helle, and didde preach to the same as the place of S. Peter dothe

testifie[1]." In the revision of the Articles in 1563 these words were omitted.

iii. **Object.** The object of the Article was to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of our Lord's descent into the realm of spirits, and to calm the controversies on the subject[2], which at the time agitated the country. But their continued violence, in spite of the effort thus made, led to the omission of the clause containing the allusion to the well-known language of S. Peter on the subject (1 Pet. iii. 19), when the Elizabethan revision was carried out in 1563. There does not seem to have been the least desire to deny that the passage in S. Peter applied to the descent of our Lord into the place of departed spirits, but simply a wish to avoid any theorising on this mysterious subject, which might only rouse still further disputation.

iv. **The descent into Hell** is not an Article which is found in the oldest Creeds of the Church. The Nicene Creed after dealing with the fact of our Lord's death proceeds to speak of His Resurrection. The Apostles' Creed and the *Quicunque Vult*, as also our present Article, following their example, declare what happened to His human spirit after death. The actual expression "Descendit ad inferna" or "ad inferos" occurs first in the Arian Creed of

[1] The following sentence is added in one MS.: "At suo ad inferos descensu nullos a carceribus aut tormentis liberavit Christus Dominus." Hardwick, p. 292, *n.*

[2] Particularly in the Diocese of Exeter. See the quotation from the Papers of Alley, Bishop of Exeter, in 1563. "There have been," he writes, "in my Diocese great invectives between the preachers, one against the other, and also partakers with them; some holding that the going down of Christ His Son to hell was nothing else but the virtue and strength of Christ His death, to be made manifest and known to them that were dead before. Others say that *descendit ad inferna* is nothing else but that Christ did sustain upon the Cross the infernal pains of hell when He called, *Pater, quare me dereliquisti?* i.e., "Father, why hast Thou forsaken me?" Finally others preach that this Article is not contained in other symbols, neither in the symbol of Cyprian, or rather Rufine. And all these sayings they ground upon Erasmus and the Germans, and especially upon the authority of Mr Calvin and Mr Bullinger." Strype's *Annals*, i. Pt i. p. 348.

the Council of Ariminum about the middle of the fourth century[1], and in the Creed of the Church of Aquileia about A.D. 400[2]. It had then no place in the Roman Creed, but it is found in the Creed commented on by Venantius Fortunatus towards the end of the sixth century, and thenceforth is of frequent occurrence[3].

v. **The word Hell,** as used in the Article and in our English Version of the Creeds, is not to be confounded with "the place of torment[4]," or "the bottomless pit[5]." It is the same as the Hebrew Sheol and the Greek Hades[6], which denote "the covered place," "the invisible underworld." This was represented by the Jews under a threefold phrase:—(i) "The Garden of Eden" or "Paradise[7]"; (ii) "Under the throne of glory[8]"; (iii) "In Abraham's bosom[9]."

[1] See Canon Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 135.

[2] Heurtley's *History of the Earlier Formularies of Faith*, p. 33.

[3] That is after the spread of the Apollinarian heresy, which it may have been mainly intended to counteract. See Dean Luckock's *Intermediate State*, p. 128. When the Apollinarians denied our Lord's possession of a rational human soul, S. Athanasius asked them how they explained the Descent into Hell. Did He indeed divide His outer man into two parts, and thus manifest Himself at once in the tomb and in Hades? And the question was fatal to the position which they assumed. Μήτι γε διχῇ μερίσας τὸν ἑξωθεν, καὶ ἐν τάφῳ ἐπεδείκνυτο καὶ ἐν Ἅιδῃ; S. Athan. *De Incarn. Christi contra Apoll.*, p. 491 C.

[4] Γέεννα, Matt. v. 30; xxiii. 33; Mark ix. 43—47; Luke xii. 5.

[5] Ἡ Ἄβυσσος, Luke viii. 31; Rom. x. 7; Apoc. ix. 2, 11.

[6] The English word Hell is derived from the A. S. *hélan=to hide, cover,* or *conceal.* Compare Myrc's *Instructions for Parish Priests*, 1053, 1506.

"Hast thou i-founde any þynge
And *helet* it at askynge?
Tell me, sone, now all smerte
For alle þat þou *helest* now fro me."
Early English Text Society, pp. 32, 46.

Compare also Wiclif's *Lollard Doctrines*, "Be it made unto him a clobe þat he is *helid* wiþ, and a belt þat he is giþ wiþ."

[7] From the Greek word παράδεισος, originally a Persian word, denoting the park of a king rich in fruits and flowers. The word occurs in (i) Luke xxiii. 43; (ii) 2 Cor. xii. 4; (iii) Apoc. ii. 7. See Edersheim's *Life of Jesus of Nazareth*, ii. p. 599; Trench's *Epp. to the Seven Churches*, pp. 93, 94.

[8] Or "Under the Altar." Comp. Apoc. vi. 9, εἶδον ὑποκάτω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐσφαγμένων.

[9] Comp. Luke xvi. 22, where it is said of Lazarus that after death he was borne ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Ἀβραάμ.

vi. **The Fact** of our Lord's descent into Hades is proved most clearly from Scripture:—

(α) By His own words to the repentant malefactor on the Cross, *This day shalt thou be with Me in Paradise* (Luke xxiii. 43);

(β) By the words of S. Peter on the day of Pentecost, when, applying the prophetic language of the sixteenth Psalm, he distinctly states respecting our Lord *that His soul was not left in Hades, neither did His flesh see corruption* (Acts ii. 31)[1].

(γ) By the words of S. Paul, when he says of Christ that *He, Who ascended, is the same that descended into the lower parts of the earth* (Eph. iv. 9)[2];

(δ) By the words of S. Peter in his first Epistle, when he affirms that *Christ was put to death in His flesh, but was quickened in His spirit*[3], and that *in His spirit He went*[4] *and preached*[5] *to the spirits in prison*[6], *who aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited*[7]

[1] Where it is clear that if His soul was not *left* in Hades, He must Himself have been there.

[2] Κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς. The most ancient writers, Iren. *adv. Hær.* v. 31; Origen *on Matt.* 31, understood this to refer to the descent into Hades, and an almost identical phrase κατελθόντα εἰς τὰ κατώτατα was used in the Greek translation of the Aquileian Creed as the equivalent of the Latin *descendit ad inferos.*

[3] Comp. Vulg. *Mortificatus quidem carne, vivificatus autem spiritu.*

[4] Πορευθείς. The word must refer to an actual transference, just as in 1 Pet. iii. 22 we have πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν.

[5] Ἐκήρυξεν = He *proclaimed* as a herald. The word is nearly equivalent to εὐηγγελίσατο, as in other places of the New Testament. "The word had been familiar to the Apostle's ear during his Lord's ministry on earth. It had become familiar to the Church through the oral or written narratives of the Gospel history." Dean Plumptre *in loc.*

[6] Φυλακή from φυλάσσειν denotes (i) *A watch of the night* (Matt. xiv. 25; Luke xii. 38); (ii) *a place of safe keeping, a prison* (Mark vi. 17, 27; John iii. 24; Acts v. 19; xii. 4; xvi. 27, &c.). Here it denotes the place of waiting appointed by God as the habitation of disembodied souls, between death and the resurrection. See Bishop Horsley's *Sermon* on the text.

[7] Ἀπεξεδέχετο. For the word compare Rom. viii. 19, 23; 1 Cor. i. 7; Gal. v. 5. Observe the imperfect

in the days of Noah[1], *while the ark was preparing* (1 Pet. iii. 18—20).

vii. **As to the practical Lessons** which our Lord's descent teaches, we learn:—

(*a*) That as perfect Man He condescended to endure to the full all the limitations which pertain to man;

(*b*) That He hallowed every condition of human existence;

(*c*) That death has no mystery which He has not fathomed;

(*d*) That there is nothing in the fact of death, nothing in the consequences of death, which He has not endured for us.

viii. **The completeness** of His mediatorial work required that He should fully experience and thereby fully overcome the power of death[2]. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of our beholding Jesus *made a little lower than the angels...that by the grace of God He should taste death*[3] *for every man* (Heb. ii. 9). By the term "taste" the writer means that our Lord really experienced all that death means on our behalf, as only a perfectly Holy Being

tense = *was waiting* during the whole period of their disobedience, i.e. 120 years (Gen. vi. 3). The ἀπὸ denotes the full time during which the waiting was exercised. "Exspectabat donec exspectandi finis erat." Bengel.

The prominence given to the history of Noah in our Lord's eschatological teaching comes out in S. Matt. xxiv. 37, 38; Luke xvii. 26, 27. That His words made a great impression on S. Peter's mind and recollection may be inferred both from the present passage and from 2 Pet. ii. 5; iii. 6.

[1] "Eo probabilius est nonnullos ex tanta multitudine, veniente pluvia, resipuisse; cumque non credidissent, dum exspectaret Deus, dum arca strueretur, postea, cum arca structa esset, et pœna ingrueret, credere cœpisse; quibus postea Christus, eorumque similibus, se præconem gratiæ præstiterit." Bengel *in loc.*

[2] Comp. Tertull. *de Anima*, c. 55, "Hic quoque legi satisfecit, forma humanæ mortis apud inferos functus"; S. Hilar. *Tract. in Psalm.* liii., "Quam descensionem Dominus ad consummationem veri hominis non recusavit."

[3] For the expression γεύσηται θανάτου comp. Matt. xvi. 28; John viii. 52, and Westcott's note *in loc.*

was able to do[1]. Such an experience would naturally involve the descent into Hades, for only thus could He become acquainted with death and all that follows death. Moreover the descent into Hades was essential to His conquest of death[2]. In the vision of Himself in His glorified humanity to S. John He reassures the terrified Apostle with the words, *I am the First and the Last and the Living One; and I became dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore and I have the keys of death and of Hades* (Apoc. i. 17, 18)[3]. Now He could not have had the keys of Hades unless He had Himself been in Hades, and His possession of the keys of Hades proved His conquest of death, and that He had *led captivity captive*[4] (Eph. iv. 8).

ix. **The Issues of the Descent.** What was the exact purport and issue of His activity in the abode of departed spirits we are not told, but only that invested

[1] "Man, as he is, cannot feel the full significance of death, the consequence of sin, though he is subject to the fear of it; but Christ, in His sinlessness, perfectly realised its awfulness. In this fact lies the immeasurable difference between the death of Christ, simply as death, and that of the holiest martyr." Westcott on Heb. ii. 9.

[2] "By His descent into Hades, Christ revealed Himself as the Redeemer of all souls. The descent into the realm of the dead gave expression to the truth, that the distinctions Here and There—the limits of place—are of no significance regarding Christ, and do not concern His kingdom." Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 316.

[3] Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, καὶ ὁ ζῶν· καὶ ἐγενόμην νεκρός, καὶ ἰδοὺ ζῶν εἰμι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ᾅδου. Apoc. i. 18. "Our Lord used the key of Hades on the Cross when He admitted the soul of the Penitent into *Paradise* (Luke xxiii. 43), and He will use it at the Great Day, when He will unlock the gates of Hades, and will call forth the spirits of all men, and reunite every soul to its own body, which He will raise from the grave (Joh. v. 28)." Bp Wordsworth *in loc.*

[4] Σταυροῦται, θάπτεται, κατέρχεται εἰς τὰ καταχθόνια ἐν θεότητι καὶ ἐν ψυχῇ· αἰχμαλωτεύεται τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν. S. Epiph. *adv. Hær.* i. 20. Captivity in the abstract is put for the concrete; whether the concrete be active, "him who makes captive," or passive, "those who are made captive," is immaterial to the final result, for if Christ led captive the conqueror, He thereby freed the conquered; if He led captive "the conquered," He must first have "led captive the conqueror."

with His human spirit[1] *He went and preached to the spirits in prison* (1 Pet. iii. 19), and we gather from a passage in the succeeding chapter of S. Peter's Epistle that He preached to them "a Gospel" (1 Pet. iv. 6), and so the power of His Passion was felt in the unseen world, even before His Resurrection[2]. The Catholic doctors of the early Church fully acknowledged that the Advent of the Lord in the spiritual world must have been a source of blessedness to the holy souls in Abraham's bosom. Hades without Him, and Hades with Him as the possessor of its keys, must have been two different places. But the question whether His visit made any difference in their subsequent condition was more open to dispute. Some held that it made none. Others held that He delivered some souls from Hades[3], and carried them to a better place, even to His kingdom of glory. On this point, however, Scripture preserves an impressive and significant silence. We may surely acquiesce in the opinion of S. Augustine that we "cannot believe Christ went down to Hades in vain[4]," and leave the results under the shadow of His throne, Who by His descent into the unseen world

[1] There is no reference here to the Holy Spirit. There is simply the antithesis between the lower and higher parts of Christ's human nature, between His flesh and His spirit. Compare Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 212.

[2] "So also His dead Body, in the world of sense, gave signs of what was to come. The blood and water which issued from the wound of the spear was not a sign of death. The separation of the blood and the water, or *serum*, which takes place in such a rupture of the heart as our Lord is thought by some to have died of, would be the beginning of decomposition and corruption; and the sinless flesh of Jesus, though subject to death, was not subject to corruption (Acts ii. 31). We ought, therefore, rather to see in the outpouring of the blood and water, a sign that the dead body of Christ was being prepared for the coming Resurrection." *Ibid.* p. 213.

[3] "The Gospel of Nicodemus dealt very fully with the delivery of souls from Hades, and 'the Harrowing of Hell,' as it was technically called in England, became a favourite subject of religious art in the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries, as may be seen in the works of Taddeo Gaddi and Simone Memmi, in the chapter-house of Santa Maria Novella at Florence." Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, p. 53.

[4] S. August. *Epist. ad Euodium*, clxiv.

has proved that "no powers of nature, no limits of space or time, could hinder Him from finding His way to souls[1]."

[1] See Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 316. "We are sure that the fruits of Christ's work are made available for every man; we are sure that He crowned every act of faith in patriarch or king or prophet or saint with perfect joy; but how and when we know not, and, as far as appears, we have no faculty for knowing." Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 77.

Article IV.

1563.	1571.
Resurrectio Christi.	*Of the Resurrection of Christe.*
Christus vere a mortuis resurrexit, suumque corpus cum carne, ossibus, omnibusque ad integritatem humanæ naturæ pertinentibus, recepit, cum quibus in cœlum ascendit, ibique residet, quoad extremo die ad iudicandos [ ] homines reuersurus sit.	Christe dyd truely aryse agayne from death, and toke agayne his body, with flesh, bones, and all thinges apparteyning to the perfection of mans nature, wherewith he ascended into heauen, and there sitteth, vntyll he returne to iudge all men at the last day.

i. **Connection.** The fourth Article follows the third in the order suggested by the historical facts of which it treats, for, as the third Article of the Forty-two expressed it, "the bodie laye in the sepulchre, untill the resurrection; but his Ghoste departing from hym, was with the ghostes that were in prison or in Helle."

ii. **The Title,** as found both in Latin and in English in the Forty-two Articles of 1553, corresponds with the Latin title of 1563. The Latin Edition of 1571, printed by John Day, and published by Royal authority, has "De Resurrectione Christi," and so corresponds with the authoritative English Edition of the same year.

iii. **The Source,** from which the Article is derived, cannot be indicated with quite the same certainty as in the case of the previous Articles. When, however, we consider that the Treatise called *Reformatio Rerum Ecclesiasticarum* was being compiled during much the same

period as the Articles, and that the compilers of the two formularies were in a large degree the same persons, it is possible that here and elsewhere the Articles may have been influenced by the wording of the *Reformatio*. The latter formulary does not any more than the Article itself appear to borrow from any known Confession, and it is not improbable that we have in it the language of the compilers themselves.

iv. **Object.** The Article is complementary to the second and third, and affirms the proper Manhood[1] of our Lord after His Resurrection in opposition to the fanatical, half-docetic school of the Anabaptists. Of these some impugned the record of the Resurrection as a literal fact, and contended that the flesh of Christ had never been the flesh of a created being, and is now so deified as to retain no semblance of humanity[2]. The intention, therefore, of the Article is to assert that having taken the Manhood into God, our Lord did not lay it aside when He conquered death, but in that manhood arose from the grave, in that manhood ascended to heaven, in that manhood sitteth at the right hand of God, and in that manhood will return to judge all mankind.

[1] "Credatur item Dominus noster Jesus Christus, etiam post resurrectionem, duplici natura constare; divina quidem, immensa, incircumscripta, et infinita, quæ ubique sit et omnia impleat; humana vero, finita et descripta humani corporis terminis ac finibus, qua, postquam peccata nostra perpurgavisset, in cœlos ascendit, ibique ita sedet ad dexteram Patris, ut non ubique sit, quippe quem oportet in cœlo remanere, usque ad tempus restitutionis omnium, cum ad judicandos vivos et mortuos veniet, ut reddat cuique juxta opera sua." *Ref. Leg. de Summa Trin.* c. 4.

[2] This was specially the teaching of Caspar Schwenckfeld, a Silesian nobleman, born in 1490. He maintained that (1) our Lord's flesh is now so deified as to be properly Divine; (2) His proper Humanity was not created of the substance of the Blessed Virgin, but came down from heaven. See Hardwick's *Hist. Ref.*, pp. 266, 267. Compelled to leave Silesia in 1528 Schwenckfeld consorted with various sections of the Anabaptists, and Ranke thinks it highly probable that his influence contributed largely to the development of the more mystical forms of Anabaptism. Ranke, *Reform.* iii. 563.

v. **Analysis.** The Article may be thus divided :—

(i) It asserts the reality of Christ's Resurrection from death;

(ii) It affirms that He "took again His Body with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature";

(iii) It identifies the Resurrection Body with that in which He ascended up on high;

(iv) It states the fact of the heavenly Session;

(v) It affirms the fact and purpose of the Second Advent.

(α) *The Fact of the Resurrection.*

vi. **The First Propagators** of the Faith placed the fact of the Resurrection in the very forefront of their preaching[1]. They distinctly asserted that Jesus of Nazareth, Who had been seen and known by many to whom they spoke, Whose crucifixion had been public and notorious, had actually risen from the dead in accordance with His own pledge beforehand that this event would take place[2]. The filling up of the Apostolic College[3], the first sermon of S. Peter on the day of Pentecost[4], the declaration of the Apostles Peter and John before the Sanhedrim[5], the first address of S. Paul at Antioch[6], his subsequent addresses at Thessalonica[7] and especially at Athens[8], the declarations contained in all his Epistles, and notably the first to the Corinthians[9], all proceed upon the assumption of the

[1] "The historical truth of the Resurrection is a most serious matter, and must be capable of standing the severest historical criticism, for if Christ did not rise again from death to life—'cadit quæstio'—all Christian dogma, all Christian faith, is at an end." *Lux Mundi*, p. 236.

[2] Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 23.
[3] Acts i. 21, 22.
[4] Acts ii. 32.
[5] Acts iv. 10.
[6] Acts xiii. 30.
[7] Acts xvii. 3.
[8] Acts xvii. 31.
[9] 1 Cor. xv. *passim*.

Resurrection as a literal, historical fact, all regard it as the very kernel of the Christian teaching.

vii. **The Early Fathers** naturally follow their example, and put forward the Resurrection as the keystone of the Christian Faith. Thus

(*a*) Ignatius writes "I know and believe that even after His Resurrection He was in the flesh[1]";

(*b*) Irenæus in his Creed of the Church of Lyons and Vienne puts forward the Resurrection of our Lord as one of its most definite Articles[2];

(*c*) Justin Martyr says, "At His Crucifixion even they that were acquainted with Him all denied and forsook Him; but afterwards, when He rose from the dead, He taught them to read the prophecies, in which all these things were foretold to happen[3]";

(*d*) Tertullian writes, "Believing the Resurrection of Christ, we believe also in our own for whom He died and rose again[4]";

(*e*) S. Chrysostom writes, "If Christ did not rise again, the whole reason of the Dispensation is overthrown[5]."

viii. **Attestations of the Event.** The fact of the Resurrection is attested by the witness of *enemies* and *friends*:—

(α) *Of enemies*:—

(1) The Roman guard, placed to watch the sepulchre by Pilate at the request of the

[1] Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* iii. Ἐγὼ γὰρ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτὸν οἶδα καὶ πιστεύω ὄντα...μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν [καὶ] συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς καὶ συνέπιεν ὡς σαρκικός, καίπερ πνευματικῶς ἡνωμένος τῷ πατρί.

[2] Irenæus *adv. Hær.* i. 10. 1, Ed. Massuet. Τὴν ἔγερσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

[3] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. c. 50.

[4] Tertull. *De Patientia*, cap. ix.

[5] *Hom. in Gen.* lviii. 3.

Jewish Sanhedrim, went into the city and positively announced to the chief priests that He was risen from the tomb (Matt. xxviii. 11);

(2) The Rulers thereupon called a council and gave heavy bribes to the soldiers to induce them to affirm that the disciples had stolen away the Body during the night and while they slept[1];

(3) This story was accordingly actually spread abroad and received credence, showing that the disappearance of the Body could not be disproved (Matt. xxviii. 15).

(β) *Of friends:—*

This testimony is of the most varied kind, and comes to us from

(1) Mary of Magdala (John xx. 11—18); the other ministering women (Matt. xxviii. 9); the two disciples journeying to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 13—35); S. Peter (Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5); the Ten (Luke xxiv. 36—43);

(2) S. Thomas (John xx. 24—29); the Seven by the lake-side (John xxi. 1—14); the Five Hundred brethren on the appointed mountain (Matt. xxviii. 16—18; 1 Cor. xv. 6);

(3) James the Lord's brother (1 Cor. xv. 7), and the whole Apostolic body just before the Ascension (Luke xxiv. 50).

They saw Him not once, but many times, not separately

[1] Ἀργύρια ἱκανὰ ἔδωκαν τοῖς στρατιώταις λέγοντες, Εἴπατε ὅτι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς ἐλθόντες ἔκλεψαν αὐτὸν ἡμῶν κοιμωμένων. Matt. xxviii. 13.

but together, not by night only but by day. They not only saw Him, but conversed with Him, ate in His presence, and beheld His Hands and His Feet. They could not all have been deceived. They could not all have been false.

ix. **Three well-known Non-Christian** explanations of the event here require to be noticed:—

(i) *Some deny the reality of our Lord's death.* They contend[1]

(*a*) That the rapidity, with which He is recorded to have died, was quite unusual in cases of crucifixion, and that the supposed death was a swoon;

(*b*) That consciousness was restored by the coolness of the rock-hewn tomb, and the pungency of the spices, and that as a fact such cases have been known to occur.

But to this it may be replied that,

(*a*) So far from the recovery, which is thus supposed, being probable, the fact is that it was extremely difficult, with the best medical aid, to save the life of a crucified person[2], and this would have been impossible in the case of our Lord after all the severities He had endured;

(*b*) The resuscitation of a person only just not dead could not have conveyed the immediate impression of a triumph over death[3];

[1] Schleiermacher, Paulus, Hase and others. See Christlieb's *Modern Doubt*, p. 455.

[2] Josephus records that on the occasion of the expedition of Titus into Judæa three persons, known to the centurion to have been crucified, were at his intercession taken down from the Cross, but of the three, only one, in spite of every care, survived. See Godet's *Lectures in Defence of the Christian Faith*, i. p. 24.

[3] "A man half-dead, dragging himself in languor out of his tomb, with

(*c*) The explanation is inconsistent with our Lord's character in respect to His veracity. The fraud practised would have been as certain of detection as morally damaging;

(*d*) Scripture reveals an unmistakeable difference in our Lord's Body before and after His Resurrection.

(ii) *Others maintain that the Body was stolen away by the disciples.*

(1) This was the explanation circulated at the time by the Sadducees, and still current when S. Matthew's Gospel was written. It was also subsequently maintained by Celsus the Jew in his controversy with Origen[1];

(2) But it gains little serious acceptance in the present day, and it is sufficient to say that the exalted morality taught and practised by the disciples is incompatible with the existence of an act of deliberate deception as the very basis of their life and work[2].

wounds requiring careful and continuous medical treatment,—could he in such a state have produced upon the minds of his disciples the impression that he was the victor over death and the grave, the Prince of Life?—an impression which nevertheless was the source and spring of all their subsequent activity." Strauss, *Life of Jesus*, p. 298, Ed. 1864. See Christlieb, p. 457. Moreover the active exertion of the journey to Emmaus would have been impossible for a man "half-dead, dragging himself in languor" from a tomb in which he had been placed as dead but three days before. See the Bp of Derry's *Primary Convictions*, p. 104.

[1] "Ἄνδρας χειροτονήσαντες ἐκλεκτοὺς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπέμψατε, κηρύσσοντας ὅτι..."οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κλέψαντες αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ μνήματος νυκτὸς...πλανῶσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους λέγοντες ἐγηγέρθαι αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν." Just. Mart. *Dial. cum Tryph.*, § 108; Origen *contra Cels.*, ii. 56; see Milligan's *Resurrection of our Lord*, p. 79.

[2] Others with Bauer abandon the position of valid criticism, and contend that what really happened at that which we call the Resurrection, remains outside the sphere of historical "investigation." See Godet's *Defence*, i. 36, 37.

(iii) *Others hold the appearances of our Lord to have been subjective and unreal.*

This is what is commonly called "the Theory of Visions," and is the explanation most commonly accepted by Rationalists at the present day. It supposes the disciples to have been either the victims of an hallucination or in a state of ecstasy. The theory is sought to be supported by the following considerations:

(α) The excitement of the Apostles and especially of the Holy Women and Mary of Magdala on their visit to the tomb;

(β) The difficulty of believing that Jesus was really gone;

(γ) The familiarity of the Jews with the idea of a resurrection from the dead;

(δ) The traditions connected with some of the Old Testament Saints;

(ϵ) The language of prophecy respecting the Messiah, and the actual predictions of Jesus.

x. **Refutation of the Theory of Visions.** Now it is important to notice at the outset that even were it possible to reconcile this theory with the actual circumstances, it would fail to satisfy the requirements of an *historical* religion, for no degree of intensity in the *subjective* experience of the disciples can constitute the *objective* reality of the appearances themselves. Their objectivity is essential to their significance. "A conviction that a particular person had risen again when he had *not* is simply false, however it may have been produced[1]." But to take the considera-

[1] Bp Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 4.

tions separately, what is their worth, when tested by the facts?

(*a*) The supposed excitement is inconsistent with

(1) The calm deliberate use of the critical faculty on the part of the disciples to which the Scriptures testify[1];

(2) The settled depression of S. Peter and S. John[2] in the early morning and of Cleopas and his companion[3] on the afternoon of the first Easter Day;

(3) The practical collected forethought displayed by the disciples during the great forty days, and the ten days that followed[4]:

(*b*) The Holy Women expected to find a *dead* body in a closed sepulchre (Mark xvi. 3); and the solution of the empty sepulchre put forward by Mary of Magdala was that the dead body had been removed;

(*c*) The language of Martha (John xi. 24) proves that the idea of a resurrection previous to the last day was quite unfamiliar to the Jewish mind;

(*d*) The return to earth of a translated saint like Enoch, Moses, and Elijah is quite different from a resurrection. Such a person is not supposed to die, and death therefore is not conquered but avoided. Such a return is not a rising from the grave at all, but a mission from heaven[5];

[1] See Matt. xxviii. 7, 10; Mark xvi. 9—14; Luke xxiv. 37 sqq.; John xx. 25. The language of Matt. xxviii. 17, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν, compared with that of Acts i. 14; iv. 33 implies the use and satisfaction of the critical faculty.

[2] John xx. 1—10.

[3] Luke xxiv. 21.

[4] See Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts i. 3, 4, 14; ii. iii. and iv. *passim*.

[5] "There was, it is true, a popular expectation that Elijah or some other

(*e*) Nothing in Scripture indicates that the disciples either appreciated any prophetic reference to the Resurrection of the Messiah, or understood our Lord's predictions of it[1]. On the contrary, when the event had actually occurred, the report of it seemed foolish babble[2], and the appearance of the Risen Lord, so far from being welcomed as the expected, was shunned as a phantasm, and nothing less than contact assured the Apostles of the reality.

xi. **Further considerations.** But there are certain other considerations which are irreconcileable with the Theory of Visions.

(*a*) The state of mind liable to the supposed vision has been explained as hallucination or ecstasy. Now the former is "a symptom of some grave physical or moral derangement[3]," and the latter has been defined as being "an affection of the brain in which the exaltation of certain ideas so absorbs the attention that sensation is suspended, voluntary movement arrested, and even the vital actions often retarded[4]." Were Cleopas and his companion walking involuntarily to Emmaus when Jesus joined them by the way? Was it of the result of suspended sensation that S. John could write, *That which*

of the old prophets should be sent from heaven, whither they had been specially withdrawn, to prepare the advent of the Messiah; but this expectation.....centered in a direct mission from God, and not in a rising from the grave to a new life." Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 51.

[1] See Mark ix. 9 sqq.; John ii. 22.

[2] Λῆρος, Luke xxiv. 11. Renan understands the word in the sense of delirium; this is, however, a derived and rare sense, found only in medical writers. The original sense is *nonsense, empty babble.*

[3] Godet, *Defence of the Christian Faith*, p. 30.

[4] Nysten, *Dictionnaire de Médecine*, Ed. Littré et Robinson, quoted by Godet, pp. 74, 75.

we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, that which our hands handled, concerning the Word of Life...declare we unto you (1 John i. 1, 3)?

(*b*) Again, comparing the disciples before and after the appearances, we observe that while they are the same individuals[1], their moral nature has been entirely transformed and their conception of the Person and Work of their Lord has immeasurably advanced[2]. Is a merely *subjective* experience an adequate explanation of such a change[3]?

(*c*) Moreover the circumstances of the appearances themselves are inconsistent with the Theory of Visions:—For

(1) Their duration must have sometimes been protracted. A considerable space of time is presupposed[4], when on the way to Emmaus He interpreted to the two disciples *in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself* (Luke xxiv. 27), and when just before His Ascension He conversed with the Eleven of the things *concerning the kingdom of God* (Acts i. 3).

[1] "Those who saw our Lord in Gethsemane and on the Cross, and again upon the great Easter Sunday, cannot speak of the Resurrection without an enthusiasm which rises to almost lyrical rapture. Listen to S. John's conception of the self-consciousness of the Resurrection-life of the Risen Lord. *I am the first and the last, and the ever-living, and I became dead, and behold! I am living to the ages of the ages.* Now this joy of the disciples, attested by all the literature which remains upon the subject, is rooted in—is unaccountable without—a real and glorious Resurrection." Bp of Derry's *Primary Convictions*, p. 105.

[2] Comp. Luke xviii. 34, or John xii. 16, with Acts ii. 38 and iv. 12.

[3] "As far as we can see, there was no possible spring of hope within the disciples which could have had such an issue." Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 121.

[4] See Milligan, *The Resurrection*, p. 106.

(2) They were made to numbers of persons at once, and all such persons were at once similarly affected by them, and that on their first occurrence to them (Luke xxiv. 37; John xx. 20);

(3) They occurred first at Jerusalem, where the prevailing tone of feeling was critical and hostile, and in spite of the fact that the disciples had been led to believe that they would find our Lord in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 7, 10).

(4) They suddenly ceased[1] after forty days in spite alike of the promises of our Lord's abiding presence with the disciples, and of the stirring events of the day of Pentecost (Matt. xxviii. 20).

(β) *The Resurrection Body.*

xii. **The Article** next states that our Lord "toke agayne his body, with flesh, bones, and all thinges apparteyning to the perfection[2] of mans nature." We gather from the Gospel narrative that

(i) Our Lord did not at His Resurrection either

[1] If the visions were the result of ecstasy, why did they not continue? Exactly at the moment, when enthusiasm may have been regarded as at its height, they suddenly cease, and when we should have expected they would have increased in number and become continuous, they come to an abrupt close, and give place to a life of healthy activity on the part of the Apostolic body and the believers generally. "Psychology would rather conclude that the action of that vibration, once set in motion by the Twelve in the whole body of the Church, would continue with increasing intensity, producing a life of enjoyment altogether ecstatic, than that it should have suddenly stopped, and given place to a life of healthy practical moral activity." Keim, *The Historical Christ*, p. 136; Milligan, *The Resurrection*, pp. 110—112.

[2] Latin, *Integritatem*. Integritas from integer (*in* and *tango*) denotes (1) *freedom from disease*; (2) *soundness, vigour*; (3) *completeness, entireness*. Comp. Cic. *Fin.* v. 14 "quod cumulatur ex integritate corporis et ex mentis ratione perfecta."

(*a*) lay aside entirely His *material* body and assume an absolutely *spiritual* body[1], or (*b*) resume His material body only at special times and for special purposes[2];

(ii) He rose with a true human Body, even the particular Body proper to Himself as the Incarnate Word. Sight and contact were needed to convince the disciples of the verity and identity of the Body. They were sensible of flesh and bones, even of the very wound-prints, and our Lord invited them to handle Him and see for themselves (Luke xxiv. 36 sqq.; John xx. 27)[3].

(iii) Our Lord's human Body after His Resurrection had, without ceasing to be a true human Body, a certain independence of the conditions of time and space[4]. He comes we know not whence;

[1] See Luke xxiv. 39—43; John xx. 17, and Westcott *in loc.*

[2] The Gospels describe the manifestations in such terms as (*a*) *ἐφανερώθη*, Mark xvi. 12, 14; John xxi. 14; (*b*) *ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτόν*, John xxi. 1; (*c*) *παρέστησεν ἑαυτὸν ζῶντα*, Acts i. 3. But they afford no ground for believing in any recurrence, however momentary, to pre-Resurrection conditions, such as the occasional resumption of a material body would seem to imply.

[3] While Docetism has from the first thought to find for itself support in the circumstances of the Resurrection-Life of our Lord, the Church has insisted that the Resurrection diminished nothing of the verity of His Manhood. Thus Ignatius *ad Trall.* ix., *ὃς καὶ ἀληθῶς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ νεκρῶν*; Origen, *Contr. Cels.* ii. 16, *ὁ γὰρ ἀληθῶς ἀποθανών, εἰ ἀνέστη, ἀληθῶς ἀνέστη.*

[4] It is not sufficiently remembered that to describe a conquest of death at all, to portray the Conqueror, clothed in the mystery of the Resurrection Body, and in doing so to preserve the harmony of His moral attributes with all that has gone before, is a task transcending the art of the greatest master of poetry or fiction. "Shakespeare has rarely represented great souls of the departed as uttering more than a few words. The impression produced by their apparition is floated in to us through the language of the spectators rather than of the visitant. The presence of the Ghost in 'Hamlet' is felt in the statelier march and more solemn music of the lines which are spoken by those under the spell. But the language of the Ghost himself falls, on the whole, far short of the lofty and awful conception conveyed by the words of others, who impart to us the impression which the dramatist wishes us to form.....But the little company of disciples contained a writer whose invention was such as to raise him to the level of a perfect equality with the majestic conception

He goes we know not whither. Now He is with Mary of Magdala in the Garden. Now He is with the two on the road to Emmaus. Now He is by the Lake-side. Now He is on the appointed mountain. Such an independence of time and space had already in some degree been displayed previous to the Resurrection (Matt. xiv. 25; Mark vi. 48). But what had been hitherto, though fully *potential*, only partially *actual*, became more *fully actual* after the victory over death had been achieved[1], and our Lord speaks of Himself after His Resurrection as possessing not "flesh and blood," but "flesh and bones" (Luke xxiv. 39)[2].

If it be objected that the Humanity thereby ceases to be real, and that personal identity is destroyed, it may be replied that (*a*) an independence the same in *kind*, though less in *degree*, had been displayed already previous to the Resurrection, but this is not regarded as rendering the Humanity unreal; that (*b*) personal identity does not depend upon an identity of material particles existing in an

of a Risen God—so much at home with it that he fearlessly follows minute actions of this exalted being, and endows Him with sentence after sentence not unworthy of those Divine lips! Shakespeare himself could not have moved on these lofty ranges of imaginative fiction without an occasional breakdown, more especially as the joyous and triumphant freedom which is required for such high creations would have been fettered at every turn by the benumbing conviction that he was degrading his powers to the service of a lie." The Bp of Derry's *Primary Convictions*, pp. 98, 99.

[1] See Luke xxiv. 31, 36; John xx. 19, 26.

[2] Comp. Eph. v. 30 where the reading ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ is not without support. "The significant variation from the common formula 'flesh and blood' must have been at once intelligible to Jews, accustomed to the provisions of the Mosaic ritual, and nothing would have impressed upon them more forcibly the transfiguration of Christ's Body than the verbal omission of the element of Blood, which was for them the symbol and seal of corruptible life." Westcott, *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 162, *n.*, and *Revelation of the Risen Lord*, p. 69.

identical mutual relation. We conclude, therefore, that our Lord's Resurrection Body was not less truly human in its new condition of freedom from the limitations of time and space.

(γ) *The Ascension.*

xiii. **The Ascension Body.** The Article next asserts that the Resurrection Body was the same as that "wherewith our Lord ascended into heaven[1]." In other words it maintains the permanence of His Humanity[2]. This is a point on which the testimony of Scripture is plain. There is nothing to indicate that the Body with which the Lord's disciples *beheld Him going into heaven* (Acts i. 11)[3] was other than that with which He rose from the tomb, and this view is confirmed by the language of the Epistles. Thus

(i) The writer of that to the Hebrews bases much of his teaching on the permanence of Christ's Humanity. The very name, which he so characteristically applies to our Lord, Jesus, "the

[1] On the circumstances of the Ascension, see *Introd. to the Creeds*, pp. 164—166. "If the story of the Ascension had been of human invention, all we know of literature tells us how it would have been. Over the cradle there would have been silence, and a sky as hushed as a frozen sea. At the Ascension the air would have quivered with the melody, and the mountains have been shaken by the storm of the triumph. But because the narrative is true, the liturgical instincts of the evangelist are kept in check. The Church is supplied with no song for the Ascension-tide to form a counterpart to the 'Gloria in Excelsis.'...To the temple which the evangelist raises to the truth he will neither prefix a porch of romance, nor append an exit of fiction. Because the narrative is true, all the songs are for the cradle, all the silence is for the return to the Throne." Bp of Derry's *Primary Convictions*, p. 106.

[2] "The Manhood, which He assumed, was not annulled, when He ascended, neither was it dissolved into the majesty and glory of God." See Pusey's *Parochial Sermons*, Vol. ii., pp. 206—230.

[3] Ἐθεάσασθε. The term quite naturally expresses sense-perception of an external object, but not equally naturally a subjective vision. Contrast the use of the term *θέαμα* with that of the substantive *ὅραμα*, and we see the point of the use of the verb here. It is used in the same sense in 1 John i. 1. See Westcott *in loc.*

Christ in His Humanity[1]," and its frequent emphasis by position, implies as much.

(ii) For S. John it is one of the marks of *the deceiver and the Antichrist* that he does not confess *that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh* (2 John 7)[2].

(δ) *The Heavenly Session.*

xiv. **Our Ascended Lord,** the Article proceeds to declare, "sitteth" at the right hand of God. This follows from S. Mark's account of the Ascension, where he tells us that the *Lord Jesus was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God* (Mark xvi. 19). The same expression[3] occurs frequently in the Epistle to the Hebrews[4], and S. Paul, regarding the action of the Father, writes *God raised Christ from the dead, and set Him at His own right Hand in the heavenly regions* (Eph. i. 20). Here it is important to observe

(1) That as God is Spirit, "without body or parts," we must not understand this session as determining any posture of the Body of our Lord;

[1] Comp. Heb. iv. 14, Ἔχοντες οὖν ἀρχιερέα μέγαν, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ; vii. 22, κατὰ τοσοῦτον καὶ κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς; x. 19 sqq. The conception of the permanence of the Humanity is involved in the use of the perfect tense πέπονθεν, ii. 18; πεπειρασμένον, iv. 15.

[2] Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί. "The thought centres upon the present perfection of the Lord's Manhood which *is* still, and is to be manifested, and not upon the past fact of His coming." Westcott *in loc.*; see also Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 99, 259, 260.

[3] Comp. the language of Ps. cx. 1.

[4] Comp. Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; xii. 2. In Heb. x. 12 we read that Christ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. The word ἐκάθισεν is in sharp opposition to ἕστηκε λειτουργῶν in verse 11. Throughout the Epistle the reference is to the act of taking the royal seat καθίζειν as contrasted with καθῆσθαι. Comp. Eph. i. 20 καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, and Apoc. iii. 21, Ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου. It is noticeable that the word in the Article is not *sedet* but "resident." Residere = (1) *to sit back*, (2) *to remain sitting*. Comp. Virg. *Æn.* viii. 232, "ter fessus valle resedit"; Ovid, *Metam.* vii. 102, "medio rex ipse resedit Agmine."

(2) The phrase expresses the peculiar royalty of the Son in His glorified Humanity[1], without any negation of His standing in the heavenly regions as the Archetypal High Priest;

(3) His session implies that the Father hath conferred upon the Son all preeminence of power, favour, and felicity[2], and the place of greatest honour and most exalted dignity and most perfect bliss in the heaven of heavens[3].

(ε) *The Second Advent.*

xv. **Until He return.** The Article concludes with the statement that our Lord sitteth in heaven "until He return to judge all men at the last day." The word "until" does not imply that thenceforward our Lord will be divested of His peculiar royalty. It marks rather the point of transition from the Kingdom of Grace to the Kingdom of Glory, of which, as we say in the Nicene Creed, "there shall be no end[4]." The purpose of the second Advent is

[1] Comp. Rom. viii. 34 with Acts vii. 56. See also 1 Kings ii. 19, and Matt. xx. 21.

[2] "Beatus est, et a beatitudine, quæ dextera Patris vocatur, ipsius beatitudinis nomen est dextera Patris." S. Aug. *Serm. ad Catech.* xi. "Ad dexteram ergo intelligendum est sic dictum esse, in summa beatitudine, ubi justitia et pax et gaudium est." S. Aug. *de Fide et Symb.*, xiv.

[3] Observe the distinction between οἱ οὐρανοί the created heavens, and ὁ οὐρανός, which is "cœlum in quo Deus est etiam quando cœlum creatum nullum est, ipsa gloria divina." Schmidt quoted by Delitzsch on Heb. ix. 24. For the object of the Heavenly Session, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 170 *sqq*. We are not to conceive of His Session as though it implied a state of inactive rest. Rather our Lord maintains in heaven not a lessened, but a continual and heightened activity. He is there instated in the complete exercise of all the offices, and in the full enjoyment of all the privileges, belonging to Him as perfect Mediator, Sovereign King, High Priest, and Arch-Prophet of God's Church and people. "He did initially and in part exercise those functions upon earth; and a ground of enjoying these preeminencies He laid here; but the entire execution and possession of all, He did obtain by His Ascension into heaven, and by His Session there." Barrow's *Sermon on the Ascension.*

[4] For the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra, who taught that after the Judgment the Son would resign not only His royalty but His personality, see Westcott, *Historic Faith*, p. 199, and compare *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 195.

defined to be the Judgment of all men. That He will exercise this awful office is our Lord's own express declaration. *Neither doth the Father*, He saith, *judge any man, but He hath given all judgment unto the Son...and He gave*[1] *Him authority to execute judgment because He is the Son of Man* (John v. 22, 27)[2]. Judgment, Scripture teaches us, is the proper office of the Son in His Humanity. It belongs to Him as Mediator because He is both *Son over His (Jehovah's) House* (Heb. iii. 6), and Son of Man *taken from among men* (Heb. v. 1). Our Lord's express statement on this point is confirmed by the teaching of S. Paul, when he said to the Athenians on Mars' hill, *God hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world in righteousness by the Man whom He hath ordained* (Acts xvii. 31), and in his Epistle to the Romans he speaks of the day, *when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ* (Rom. ii. 16).

xvi. **The object** of the Judgment is all mankind—*We shall all stand*, says S. Paul, *before the judgment seat of God* (Rom. xiv. 10)[3], both *small and great* (Apoc. xx. 12)[4], *the quick and dead*[5] (2 Tim. iv. 1), and shall give account of the deeds done in the body to Him, Who alone from actual experience of human life can possess "that exact tempera-

[1] *Gave*, ἔδωκεν. The tense carries us back to the Incarnation, and beyond it, beyond all time. "Hominibus in judicio non apparebit nisi Filius. Pater occultus est, Filius manifestus. In quo est Filius manifestus? In Forma qua ascendit. Nam in Forma Dei cum Patre occultus est, in Forma servi hominibus manifestus." S. Aug. *Tract.* xxi. *in Joann.*

[2] For our Lord's prophetic utterances respecting the Judgment, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 181, 182.

[3] *We shall all stand.* All the most antithetical types of character, as the context implies. The statement indicates the regulative value, in our relations one with another, of the thought of the one βῆμα at which all alike will present themselves.

[4] Τοὺς μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς μικρούς, ἑστῶτας. "Mirabilis est *parvulorum statio*, ex quibus pars longe maxima generis humani constat." Bengel.

[5] Ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. For the word "quick," see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 184, *n.* For the various explanations of "vivos et mortuos," see S. Aug. *De Fide et Symbolo*, "Vivos et mortuos: sive istis nominibus 'justi' et 'peccatores' significentur, sive quos tunc ante mortem in terris inventurus est, appellati sint 'vivi,' 'mortui' vero qui in ejus adventu resurrecturi sunt." Comp. *ad Catech.* § 12.

ment of affection towards men, which is requisite to the distribution of equal justice towards them, according to the due measures of mercy and severity[1]," and whose perfect human nature qualifies Him to be on the one hand a *merciful and faithful High priest* (Heb. ii. 17) and on the other a faithful and merciful Judge. It is not an enemy who shall judge us, neither is it one indifferently affected towards us, it is He Who died for us upon the Cross, and Who is now our Mediator and Intercessor[2].

[1] See Pearson *on the Creed*, p. 542. For the fitness of the Judge and the reasonableness of the Judgment, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 183, *sqq*. "Sedebit Judex qui stetit sub judice. Damnabit veros reos, qui factus est falsus reus." S. Aug. *de Verb. Dom.*, Serm. lxiv.

[2] On the witness which is borne, independently of Revelation, to a future Judgment (1) by our conscience; (2) by reflection on the character of God as a just God; (3) by the consent of almost all mankind, see *Introd. to the Creeds*, pp. 189—193. "General history points to a general judgment. If there is no such judgment to come, then there is no one definite moral purpose in human society. Progress would be a melancholy word, a deceptive appearance, a stream that has no issue, a road that leads nowhere. No one who believes that there is a Personal God who guides the course of human affairs can come to the conclusion that the generations of man are to go on for ever without a winding up, which shall decide upon the doings of all who take part in human life....A drama, however long drawn out, must have a last act. The last act of the drama of history is 'The Day of the Judgment.'" Bp of Derry's *Primary Convictions*, p. 137.

Article V.

1563.	1571.
De Spiritu sancto.	*Of the holy ghost.*
Spiritus sanctus, à patre et filio procedens, eiusdem est cum patre et filio essentiæ, maiestatis, et gloriæ, uerus, ac æternus Deus.	The holy ghost, proceedyng from the father and the sonne, is of one substaunce, maiestie, and glorie, with the father and the sonne, very and eternall God.

i. **Connection.** Having dealt with the first two Persons in the Blessed Trinity, the Article proceeds to complete the dogmatic statements respecting the Trinity, by treating of the Third Person, God the Holy Ghost.

ii. **Source.** The Fifth is the first Article that has no equivalent in the series of Edward VI., but was adopted in its entirety in 1562 from the Würtemberg Articles of 1552[1].

iii. **Object.** Besides completing the dogmatic statements respecting the Trinity, the Fifth Article has for its object to refute the erroneous opinions current amongst many of the Anabaptist school, who reproduced the errors of Arius[2] and Macedonius[3] respecting the Holy Spirit, and

[1] "Credimus et confitemur Spiritum Sanctum ab æterno procedere a Deo Patre et Filio, et esse ejusdem cum Patre et Filio essentiæ, majestatis, et gloriæ, verum ac æternum Deum." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 127, Ed. 1859.

[2] Arius, in denying the proper Deity of the Son, by consequence denied that of the Holy Spirit also, speaking of Him as the "creature of a creature," κτίσμα κτίσματος.

[3] Macedonius taught that the Holy Ghost was διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρέτην of the Father, such in fact as all the Holy Angels. Sozom. iv. 27.

denied His Personality and Deity[1], representing Him as "the creature of a creature."

iv. **Analysis.** The Article makes three statements respecting the third Person in the Trinity:

(i) "That He proceedeth from the Father and the Son";

(ii) "That He is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son";

(iii) "That He is very and eternal God."

v. **The Characteristic of the Holy Ghost.** The First Person in the Blessed Trinity is, as we have seen[2], the sole Fountain of all being, created and uncreated. The source of the Life of the Son is in the Father by virtue of His Eternal Generation from the Father. The source of the Life of the Holy Ghost is in the Father and the Son, and His characteristic is Procession. He is "neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding[3]." The Greek verb *ἐκπορεύεσθαι*, which signifies "procession," occurs several times in the Gospels[4], and is specially used in S. John's Gospel by our Lord of the Holy Ghost[5].

vi. **He proceedeth from the Father,** for He is called the *Spirit of the Father* (Matt. x. 20); He is represented as *sent by the Father* (John xiv. 26); He is described as *given by the Father* (John xiv. 16); and in express words it is said that He *proceedeth from the Father*[6] (John xv. 26).

[1] "Illorum etiam est execrabilis impudentia, qui cum Macedonio contra Spiritum Sanctum conspiraverunt, illum pro Deo non agnoscentes." *Reformatio Legum*, de Hæresibus, c. 6. Compare also the First Article of the Thirteen of 1538.

[2] See above, p. 33.

[3] Hence the three properties attributed to the Three Persons are to the Father *ἀγεννησία*, to the Son *γέννησις*, to the Holy Ghost *ἐκπόρευσις*.

[4] Comp. Matt. iii. 5; Mark x. 46; Luke iv. 22, &c.

[5] John xv. 26, "Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ Παράκλητος...τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. The verb is once used by S. Paul (Eph. iv. 29), and several times in the Apocalypse (iv. 5; xi. 5; xix. 21; xxii. 1).

[6] Παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορεύεται. The

This last declaration is made by our Lord Himself in that discourse in which He predicted the descent of the Comforter upon the Apostles, and has accordingly been confessed in terms by every portion of the Universal Church.

vii. **He proceedeth from the Son.** Further, in the Western recension of the Nicene formula[1], He is said to proceed from the Son, and so it is stated in this Article. For

(α) He is called *the Spirit of Christ*[2] (Rom. viii. 9);

(β) He is described as *sent by the Son from the Father* (John xv. 26);

(γ) He is actually bestowed *by the Son* upon the Apostles (John xx. 22)[3].

Thus while He is termed *the Spirit of the Father*, He is also termed *the Spirit of Christ*; while He is described as *sent by the Father*, He is also described as *sent by the Son*;

preposition παρὰ here used = *from, from the side of*, is that which is habitually used with the verb *to come forth*, to denote the Mission of the Son, as John xvi. 27, Ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον; xvii. 8, παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον. The reference, then, in this verse is to the Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, and not to the Eternal Procession. This is clear from the fact that in the Creeds, when the Eternal Procession is spoken of, the phrase is uniformly "which proceedeth out of," τὸ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, where ἐκ defines the source, and the Greek Fathers, who apply this passage to the Eternal Procession, instinctively substitute ἐκ = *out of*, for παρὰ = *from*, in their application of it. See Westcott *in loc.*

[1] For an account of this addition, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 206, *n.*; Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, i. 371; ii. 204. The Council of Chalcedon had ordered that the Creed of Nicæa should be accepted by all orthodox churches throughout the world in the form in which it then stood (i.e. without the *Filioque*), and that no addition should be made thenceforward without the decision of a general Council. Now the Filioque clause never possessed such sanction. It is asserted dogmatically for the first time in a Spanish provincial Council (Toledo, A.D. 589), and seems to have been really admitted by mistake. Comp. Professor Swete's *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, pp. 169, 170. "Both the King (Reccared) and his Bishops believed the words to be a true part of the original Faith." Strong's *Manual of Theology*, p. 176.

[2] Εἰ δέ τις Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ. Rom. viii. 9.

[3] Here it is the Son, Who on the day of His Resurrection says to the Apostles Λάβετε Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον, John xx. 22.

while He is represented as *given by the Father*, He is also represented as *given by the Son*, and can be spoken of as *the Spirit of Jesus*[1] (Acts xvi. 7). So also after the effusion of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost S. Peter traces it to the fact that Jesus being *exalted to the right hand of God*, and having *received the Spirit from the Father, had poured forth* that which his hearers saw and heard (Acts ii. 33). He thus regards the Holy Ghost as bestowed by the Father upon men, but as coming to them through Christ. Similarly S. Paul writes to the Galatians, *Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father* (Gal. iv. 6)[2]. These passages tend to establish a special relation between the Holy Spirit and the Son in His glorified Humanity.

viii. **He proceedeth from the Father and the Son.** When, then, according to the Western recension of the Nicene Creed, we say that the Holy Spirit proceedeth from the Father, we mean that He proceeds from Him as the sole Fount of Deity[3]. When we say that He proceedeth from the Son, we do not mean that He proceeds from the Son as from a source independent of the Father, or that He issues forth from the Father without coming through the Son. We do not allow that there are two Principles or two Causes in the Godhead. We believe in one original Principle and one original Cause, and this is the Father, to Whom all things owe their

[1] Ἐλθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν ἐπείραζον εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορευθῆναι· καὶ οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοὺς τὸ Πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ. This is the reading attested by ℵ ABCDE. Vulg., *Spiritus Jesu*. Hence the Acts of the Apostles has been called "the Gospel of the Spirit." See Westcott's *Historic Faith*, p. 106.

[2] Τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. Comp. Philip. i. 19, ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ Πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; and 1 Pet. i. 11, τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ.

[3] He proceedeth from the Father ὡς ἐκ πηγῆς τῆς Θεότητος, as the Beginning, the Cause, the Fountain of Godhead. This S. Augustine expresses by the word *principaliter*, when he says that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father *principaliter*, as from the very source of Deity. See the *Report of the Second Bonn Conference*, 1875.

existence. The Son, who is consubstantial with the Father, is eternally begotten of Him, and owes all that He is and has to Him. The Procession, therefore, of the Holy Spirit is not from the Son as from a second fountain independent of the first. He proceeds "from the Father through the Son[1]," and "owes ultimately to the Father whatever belongs to Him as being the Spirit of the Son[2]." This phrase of St John Damascene the Greek theologians of the Council of Florence in 1439 admitted, with only five dissentients, to be equivalent to the Western Formula[3].

ix. **Consubstantial and Co-Eternal.** The Article next proceeds to state that the Holy Spirit is "of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the

[1] Comp. S. John of Damascus *De Hymno Trisag. Ep.* 28, Πνεῦμα τὸ Ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ Λόγου προϊόν. Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 81.

[2] See Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 220, 221. "A Catholic believer is free to confess that he cannot justify the way in which the *Filioque* clause was inserted by the Western Church, without the consent of the Eastern, into a Creed which was the joint heritage of all. He is bound also to acknowledge that as the clause stands, it needs guarding and qualifying. Yet it would seem like receding from the truth, if the words which assert the Double Procession of the Spirit were now to be struck out from the Creed. Western theologians agree that the Spirit does not proceed from the Son as from a second fountain independent of the first. Eastern theologians agree that the Spirit does not issue out from the Father without coming through the Son."

[3] See Canon Liddon's *Introduction to the Report of the Second Bonn Conference*, p. xxxiv.; Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, pp. 81—83. "Under the influence of S. Augustine Western theologians have thought more of the indissoluble unity of will and operation in the Holy Trinity than of the precise constitution (to speak in human language) of each single Person. To them, therefore, the indifferent conjunction 'and' is preferable to the definiteness of the Greek preposition 'through.' And the difficulty which the Greeks raised against their phraseology, that it slurred over the unity of the source of Godhead, can hardly have been before their minds. To say that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son could not suggest to them a twofold origin or principle of Deity; it would simply affirm, with the indefiniteness of inadequate language, the cooperation of the Son in that which the Father does." Strong's *Manual of Theology*, p. 179. The phrase in the Athanasian Creed, "Spiritus Sanctus *a* Patre et Filio, non factus, nec creatus, nec genitus est, sed procedens," is sufficiently general to include the two senses in which the Holy Spirit proceeds (i) from the Father, and (ii) from, i.e. through, the Son.

Son." For He is not only the Personal Power of God, but truly and essentially God. He is repeatedly indicated as such in Holy Scripture. Thus we find

(α) *Divine works* are ascribed to Him, such as Creation (Ps. xxxiii. 6), the new Birth (John iii. 3, 5), the inspiration of Holy Scripture (2 Pet. i. 21);

(β) *Divine properties* are declared to be His. He is eternal (Heb. ix. 14); He is omniscient (1 Cor. ii. 10); He is omnipotent (Luke i. 35); He is all-sovereign (1 Cor. xii. 11);

(γ) *Divine homage* is rendered to Him in the Baptismal Formula (Matt. xxviii. 19), and in the Apostolic Benediction (2 Cor. xiii. 14).

Hence in the Nicene Creed He is truly termed "The Lord," i.e. "Jehovah," and in the Athanasian Creed He is described as being equally with the Father and the Son "uncreate, infinite, eternal, all-sovereign, God, and Lord[1]."

x. **Very and Eternal God.** The same argument applies to the statement of the Article that He is very and eternal God. But to it may be added the fact that in Holy Scripture not only are Divine works ascribed to Him, but

(1) Failure to recognise Him is placed on a parallel with failure to recognise *God* Himself (1 Cor. iii. 16);

(2) To lie unto Him is to lie *unto God* (Acts v. 3, 4);

(3) To tempt Him is to tempt God (Acts v. 9)[2];

[1] "Increatus, immensus, æternus, omnipotens, Deus, Dominus." Athan. Creed.

[2] Moreover S. Paul ascribes to the Holy Ghost the words in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, which are there ascribed to the Lord of Hosts. Acts xxviii. 25 sqq.

(4) Our bodies, which are said by S. Paul to be the temples of *God* (1 Cor. iii. 16), are also the temples of *the Holy Ghost* (1 Cor. vi. 19);

(5) Sin against the Holy Ghost has a singular atrocity, it is the only irremissible sin (Matt. xii. 31, 32).

These passages all tend to confirm the doctrine of the Deity[1] of the Holy Spirit, and we believe and confess that such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost, very and eternal God[2].

[1] "That is, that He is as wholly and entirely God in the Person of the Father, as though there was no Son and Spirit; as entirely in that of the Son, as though there was no Spirit and Father; as entirely in that of the Spirit, as though there was no Father and Son." Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, vi., p. 358.

[2] For the various Offices of the Holy Ghost see *Introd. to the Creeds*, pp. 211—216.

GROUP II.

ARTICLES 6—8.

The Articles included in this group treat of the Rule of Faith and the Authoritative Documents which contain it.

They deal with

(α) *Holy Scripture,*

(1) Its paramount authority as compared with Tradition (Art. vi.);

(2) The Canonical Books (Art. vi.);

(3) The relation of the Old Testament to the New (Art. vii.);

(4) The degree of Christian obligation to the Mosaic Law (Art. vii.).

(β) *The Three Creeds* (Art. viii.).

ARTICLE VI.

1563.

Diuinæ Scripturæ doctrina sufficit ad salutem.

Scriptura sacra continet omnia quæ sunt ad salutem necessaria, ita ut quicquid in ea nec legitur, neque inde probari potest, non sit à quoquam exigendum, ut tanquam Articulus fidei credatur, aut ad necessitatem salutis requiri putetur.

Sacræ Scripturæ nomine eos Canonicos libros Veteris et Novi testamenti intelligimus, de quorum autoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est.

Catalogus librorum sacræ Canonicæ scripturæ Veteris Testamenti.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leuiticus.
Numeri.
Deuteronom.
Iosue.
Iudicum.
Ruth.
2. Regum.
Paralipom. 2.
2 Samuelis.
Esdræ. 2.
Hester.
Iob.
Psalmi.
Prouerbia.
Ecclesiastes.
Cantica.
Prophetæ maiores.
Prophetæ minores.

1571.

Of the sufficiencie of the Holy Scriptures for saluation.

Holye Scripture conteyneth all thinges necessarie to saluation: so that whatsoeuer is not read therein, nor may be proued therby, is not to be required of anye man, that it shoulde be beleued as an article of the fayth, or be thought requisite [as] necessarie to salvation.

In the name of holy Scripture, we do vnderstande those Canonicall bookes of the olde and newe Testament, of whose aucthoritie was neuer any doubt in the Churche.

Of the names and number of the Canonicall Bookes.

Genesis.
Exodus.
Leuiticus.
Numerie.
Deuteronomium.
Iosue.
Iudges.
Ruth.
The .1. boke of Samuel.
The .2. boke of Samuel.
The .1. booke of Kinges.
The .2. booke of Kinges.
The .1. booke of Chroni.
The .2. booke of Chroni.
The .1. booke of Esdras.
The .2. booke of Esdras.
The booke of Hester.
The booke of Iob.
The Psalmes.
The Prouerbes.
Ecclesia. or preacher.
Cantica, or songes of Sa.
4. Prophetes the greater.
12. Prophetes the lesse.

Alios autem Libros (ut ait Hieronymus) legit quidem Ecclesia ad exempla uitæ et formandos mores, illos tamen ad dogmata confirmanda non adhibet: ut sunt

Tertius et quartus Esdræ.
Sapientia.
Iesus filius Syrach.
Tobias. Iudith.
Libri Michabæorum. 2.
[.

]
Noui Testamenti Libros omnes (ut uulgo recepti sunt) recipimus et habemus pro Canonicis.

And the other bookes, (as Hierome sayth) the Churche doth reade for example of lyfe and instruction of maners: but yet doth it not applie them to establishe any doctrine. Such are these followyng:

The third boke of Esdras.
The fourth boke of Esdras.
The booke of Tobias.
The booke of Iudith.
The rest of the booke of Hester.
The booke of Wisdome.
Iesus the sonne of Sirach.
Baruch, the prophet.
Song of the .3. Children.
The storie of Susanna.
Of Bel and the Dragon.
The prayer of Manasses.
The .1. boke of Machab.
The .2. Booke of Macha.

All the bookes of the newe Testament, as they are commonly receaued, we do receaue and accompt them for Canonicall.

i. **Connection.** Having thus treated of the Revelation of Himself, which God has been pleased to make to us, the Articles proceed to deal with the Rule of Faith[1]. To this subject three Articles relate, the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth. The first two treat of Holy Scripture, the third of the three Creeds.

ii. **History and Language.** The present Sixth Article differs considerably from the original draft in 1553. In the first Clause, which was apparently modelled on the Fifth of the old Forty-two Articles of 1552, after the words "nor may be proved thereby," a sentence is omitted which ran thus, "although it be sometime receiued of the faithful, as Godlie, and profitable for an ordre and comelinesse." The second Clause, which relates to the testimony of the

[1] This is the logical order. "For after settling that there is a Revelation, the question follows, How is that Revelation to be made known to us? What are the Books that record it? In other words, What is the Canon of Scripture?" Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 1.

Church in determining what Books are Canonical, as also the actual list of the Canonical Books, was lacking in the first draft. These clauses were introduced in 1563 from the Würtemberg Confession[1].

iii. **Object.** The object of the Article is a twofold one. It was designed

(1) To assert the necessity of proving from Scripture the doctrines of the Church in opposition to the extreme Scholastic and Tridentine teaching respecting "the Word unwritten[2]";

(2) To condemn the error of those ultra-spiritualists, who denied the necessity of the Written Word altogether, and looked with suspicion on all "Book-Religion" as they termed it, attributing all light and knowledge to the internal illumination of the Holy Spirit[3].

iv. **Analysis.** The Article consists of three parts:—

(α) It asserts the plenary authority of Holy Scripture, as the ultimate standard of Christian Faith and Doctrine;

(β) It defines the extent and limits of such Holy Scripture, as comprising the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments;

(γ) It lays down what is the position of the Church of England as regards the Apocrypha.

[1] "Sacram Scripturam vocamus eos Canonicos libros veteris et novi Testamenti, de quorum authoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est." Würt. Conf. *de Sacra Scriptura.*

[2] Hardwick, *History of the Articles*, p. 99, ed. 1859.

[3] "In quo genere teterrimi illi sunt... qui Sacras Scripturas ad infirmorum tantum hominum debilitatem ablegant et detrudunt, sibi sic ipsi interim præfidentes, ut earum auctoritate se teneri non putent, sed *peculiarem quendam spiritum jactant*, a quo sibi omnia suppeditari aiunt, quæcunque docent et faciunt." *Reform. Leg. Eccl.* de Hæresibus, c. 3.

i. *The Plenary Authority of Holy Scripture.*

v. **The Sufficiency of Scripture.** All communities of Christians agree in this, that the Divine Rule is contained in Holy Scripture[1], but they differ as to the question whether it is to be regarded as complete, or whether anything else is needed for knowledge essential to Salvation. While the Churches, which in the sixteenth century broke off from the Roman centre, regard Holy Scripture as sufficient, the Roman Church places Tradition on the level of an authority parallel and coordinate, and represents it as necessary to supplement what is lacking in the Written Word[2].

vi. **Testimony of our Lord and His Apostles.** Our Lord and His Apostles nowhere refer for the establishment of doctrine to any authority but Holy Scripture:

(i) Our Lord Himself constantly appealed to the Old Testament, and there is hardly a Book contained in it from which He did not quote. Again and again He appealed to the Jewish Scriptures as testifying of Himself, and after His Resurrection He expounded them to His disciples, shewing that from first to last they pointed to Himself (Luke xxiv. 27);

(ii) The Apostles likewise bear the same testimony to the Jewish Scriptures. Thus

(α) S. Luke praises the Berœans because they *examined the Scriptures daily* to see whether

[1] Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 37.

[2] The Greek Church also acknowledges a so-called tradition as a coordinate source of Christian knowledge, but this relates chiefly to ecclesiastical points, such as the veneration of saints and relics, the forty days' fast, the institution of Monachism, prayers for the dead, &c. *Διαιρεῖται τὸ θεῖον ῥῆμά τε εἰς τὸ γραπτὸν καὶ ἄγραφον. καὶ ἄγραφον μὲν εἶεν ἂν αἱ ἐκκλησιαστικαὶ παραδόσεις.* See Winer, *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 38.

they agreed with the statements which S. Paul made to them (Acts xvii. 11)[1];

(β) That Apostle, writing to the Romans, says, *Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope*[2] (Rom. xv. 4);

(γ) Again he writes to Timothy, *From a babe thou hast known the sacred writings*[3], *which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus*, and he adds, *Every Scripture*[4] *inspired of God*[5] *is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work* (2 Tim. iii. 15—17).

Thus the Old Testament was received and appealed to as Scripture alike by our Lord and His Apostles, and while He ascribes error to ignorance of the Scriptures (Matt. xxii. 29)[6], He nowhere ascribes it to ignorance of any unwritten word, and He nowhere requires a knowledge of tradition as essential to salvation[7].

[1] Τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφάς, εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως, Acts xvii. 11. "Character veræ religionis, quod se dijudicari patitur." Bengel.

[2] "The Scriptures have not merely, nor primarily, an historical and archæological purpose, but a moral one." Cp. Liddon *in loc.*

[3] Ἱερὰ γράμματα = *sacras literas*, "libros Mosis et prophetarum. Nam hi exstabant cum Timotheus esset parvulus." Bengel. The expression ἱερὰ γράμματα is a ἅπαξ λεγόμ. in the New Testament.

[4] Πᾶσα γραφὴ = *omnis Scriptura*, not tota Scriptura. "Scriptura sacra, secundum omnes suas partes. Novissima quæque Epistola Pauli quam maxime commendat Scripturam." Bengel.

[5] So Origen expressly renders the clause: πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος οὖσα, ὠφέλιμός ἐστιν, *Hom. in Josue* xx. So Wiclif "every (all ?) Scripture, onspirid of God, is," &c.

[6] Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς, μηδὲ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. "Duplex hæc ignorantia mater est errorum fere omnium." Bengel.

[7] Bp Browne *on the Articles*, pp. 132—134. Our Lord did not absolutely re-

vii. **The New Testament** was gradually added to the Old, but it was some considerable period after our Lord's Ascension before any of the Books contained in it were actually written. The first work of the Apostles, and that out of which all their other functions grew, was to proclaim as heralds the Glad Tidings of the Great Hope, which had arisen for mankind, and to deliver a personal testimony to the chief facts of the Gospel History respecting the life, death, and resurrection of their Lord (Mark xvi. 15; Acts i. 21, 22)[1]. Thus the teaching of the Apostles was in the first instance *oral* and not written[2], and out of the multitude of things that Jesus did (John xxi. 25), a cycle of representative facts was gradually selected, which formed the common groundwork of their message[3]. But in the course of time another step was taken. Many, as S. Luke expressly tells us, endeavoured to commit to writing this oral Gospel, and to form in a connected shape written collections of the words and actions of our Lord (Luke i. 1—4). As long as the Twelve Apostles were

ject Tradition, but He assigned to it its proper place as compared with Scripture, much in the same way as He asserted His own proper authority as the Interpreter of Scripture. The due relations had become inverted. It was His Divine Mission to readjust them, and to declare that Scripture was not to be exclusively dominated by the stereotyped phraseology of Tradition.

[1] Bp Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, p. 57.

[2] Of the way in which the Apostles taught we have two examples (i) in the preaching of S. Peter before Cornelius (Acts x. 37—43), and (ii) in that of S. Paul in the Synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia (Acts xiii. 23—39). See Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, pp. 163—165.

[3] "The Founder of the Christian Church did not write Himself, nor did He give His disciples a commission to write. They were to go from place to place bearing witness everywhere personally by word of mouth, and claiming to be heard, and so to carry His message and form communities. When He promised them the assistance of the Holy Ghost, He was not thinking of authorship, but of the cases where they would have to speak. And even in that last solemn moment of departure, when He gave His last charges including all their Apostolic duties, there was no mention made of writing books. So, again, was it when S. Paul was called to the Apostolate. And among the *charismata* he reckons a prophetic gift, but no special gift of writing." Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, vol. i., pp. 201, 202.

living, they were themselves abiding witnesses to the facts which they preached. But when the time came for them to be scattered throughout the world, or to depart from this earthly scene, it became a matter of the highest importance that authoritative records should be put forth by those who had exceptional knowledge of the events they described[1], to supply the place of the oral teaching previously in use[2]. Thus the five historical Books of the New Testament came to be written, and twenty-one Epistles, and one Book of Prophecy, were put forth from time to time as the special circumstances and requirements of different Churches called for them[3].

viii. **Claim of the Apostles.** But though the writings of the New Testament came into existence under these circumstances, the writers, instead of appealing to any other independent and coordinate authority, make the same claim for what they wrote, as they do for the Scriptures of the Old Testament. *This we say to you by the word of the Lord,* S. Paul writes to the Thessalonians (1 Thess. iv. 15). *Which things also we speak,* he says to

[1] The insistence upon eyewitnessship of the Resurrection as a condition of Apostolate and the recognition of its value as a quality of evidence are most marked in the New Testament, and it is noteworthy how much of the Apostles' Creed, a developed form of the original *Norma Prædicationis*, is expressive of belief in facts the reality of which can be assured by the testimony of eyewitnesses. Comp. Acts i. 21, 22; xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. ix. 1; 1 John i. 1—4. See Lumby's *History of the Creeds*, pp. 6, 7, ed. 1887.

[2] We find the basis of our Gospels in the "Memoirs of the Apostles," which Justin Martyr describes as read in the Christian assemblies co-ordinately with the Prophetical Scriptures. Τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἢ τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν ἀναγνώσκεται μέχρις ἐγχωρεῖ. Just. *Apol.* i. 67.

[3] "There was no such thing with the Apostles as a previous arrangement and distribution of labour in their writings. Every one wrote as the particular occasion required, to supply the want of personal intercourse, to confirm what had been taught already by word of mouth, to answer questions, resolve doubts, denounce errors and evil customs, in short to do the very thing which was best and oftenest done by word of mouth. Paul attached greater weight to his oral teaching, to sight and speech, than to his writings." Comp. Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 10. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. pp. 202, 203.

the Corinthians, *not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth* (1 Cor. ii. 13). *The things which I write unto you,* he says again, *they are the commandment of the Lord*[1] (1 Cor. xiv. 37). Once more, writing to the Galatians, he says, *I make known unto you, brethren, as touching the Gospel, which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it*[2]*, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ* (Gal. i. 11, 12). The Apostle nowhere appeals to any oral teaching besides his own as of coordinate authority with his. He speaks as one conscious that he is under the guidance and suggestion of the Holy Spirit, as much as the writers of the Old Testament[3].

ix. **Tradition.** Thus without laying down any theory of Inspiration, the Church of England declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation[4]." The Roman Church, on the other hand, holds that there is an unwritten word of God, or *tradition*, which is of equal

[1] Εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός, ἐπιγινωσκέτω ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅτι Κυρίου ἐστὶν ἐντολή. "Indicet atque agnoscat ea, quæ scribo vobis, esse præcepta Christi Domini." Est. The Κυρίου, as its position indicates, is emphatic. "The Apostle here speaks with the full spiritual knowledge that the rules given in this Chapter are no mere expressions of his own judgment, but are verily a collective ἐντολή of the personal Lord, speaking as it were by His Apostle as His interpreter." Bp Ellicott *in loc.*

[2] "Ἐδιδάχθην is added to explain and enforce παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον, and thus to bring out the contrast with δι' ἀποκαλύψεως: 'I received it not by *instruction* from man but by *revelation* from Christ.'" Bp Lightfoot *in loc.*

[3] "Each Apostle possessed in solidarity not a divided or partial, but a complete right of superintendence over the Christian communities"; in such exercise of his Apostolate each Apostle was under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost, and of such exercise important parts were the delivery of oral teaching, the compilation of personal memoirs, and the issue of special and encyclical epistles; the Apostolate ceased when the vocation and bestowal ceased from God. Comp. John xiv. 26; 2 Cor. xi. 28; Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. 113 sqq.

[4] Comp. Card. Bellarmine, *De Verbo Dei*, iv. 3; "Nos asserimus, in Scripturis non contineri *expresse* totam doctrinam necessariam sive de fide sive de moribus, et proinde præter Verbum Dei scriptum requiri etiam Verbum Dei non scriptum, i.e. divinas et Apostolicas traditiones."

value and authority with the written Word. The Council of Trent declares that "the truth of the Christian Revelation is contained in the written Word and in the unwritten Tradition, and that the Council receives and venerates with an equal feeling of piety and reverence all the Books of the Old and New Testaments...and also the traditions relating as well to faith as to morals, as having been, either from the word of Christ Himself, or the dictation of the Holy Ghost, preserved by continuous succession in the Catholic Church[1]." This teaching makes tradition an authority independent of Holy Scripture, so that Scripture is not the *sole* source of Catholic truth, and it holds that an Article of the Faith may rest on Church teaching alone, as a sufficient basis in itself[2]. But this is a departure from the primitive conception of the authority of Scripture. For on turning to

x. **The Testimony of the Fathers,** we find

(*a*) Irenæus saying, "We know the Scriptures are perfect as being spoken by the Word of God and His Spirit[3]";

(*b*) Tertullian writes, "I adore the fulness of Scripture, which declares to me the Creator and His works[4]";

[1] See Conc. Trid. Sess. iv. *Decr. de Canonic. Scripturis.* "Orthodoxorum patrum exempla secuta [Ecclesia], omnes libros tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti, cum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor, necnon *traditiones ipsas*, tum ad fidem, tum ad mores pertinentes, tanquam vel oretenus a Christo vel a Spiritu Sancto dictatas, et continua successione in Ecclesia Catholica conservatas, *pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur.*" The *Cat. Rom. Quæst.* 12 says, "Omnis doctrinæ ratio, quæ fidelibus tradenda sit, Verbo Dei continetur, quod in Scripturam traditionesque distributum est."

[2] See Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, pp. 58, 59.

[3] "Scripturæ quidem *perfectæ* sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu Ejus dictæ," Lib. ii. c. 47.

[4] "Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, quæ mihi et Factorem manifestat et facta....Si non est scriptum, timeat Væ illud, *adjicientibus aut detrahentibus* destinatum." *Adv. Hermogenem*, c. 22.

(*c*) Origen says, "In the two Testaments.....every word that appertains to God may be sought out and discussed, and out of them all knowledge of things may be understood. And if anything remains, which Holy Scripture does not determine, no third Scripture ought to be received to authorise any knowledge[1]."

(*d*) Again S. Chrysostom writes, "Look for no other teacher, thou hast the oracles of God; none teaches thee like these[2]."

(*e*) Once more S. Augustine says, "In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, all things are found, which embrace faith and morals[3]."

Such quotations might be greatly multiplied[4]. Those given are sufficient to shew that the Fathers of the Primitive Church found the Rule of Faith (*a*) in the Bible as its sole source, and (*b*) in the Creeds as interpreting the Bible. They did not appeal to some *independent* tradition[5],

[1] "In hoc biduo puto duo Testamenta posse intelligi, in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet requiri et discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam Scripturam debet ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi." Orig. *Hom.* v. *in Levit.*

[2] *Hom.* ix. *in Ep. ad Coloss.*

[3] "In eis enim quæ aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem, moresque vivendi." *De Doctrina Christ.* Lib. ii. c. 9.

[4] See Palmer *on the Church*, ii. pp. 10 ff.

[5] The English Church is by her consistent appeal to history pledged to respect Catholic Tradition; she deals with it by the golden rule of St Vincent of Lerins, the "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." The statement that "dogma has triumphed over history" is as alien from her spirit, as is that doctrine of private judgment of which it is but a correct expression. Yet the English Church is, by her freedom from foreclosure, equally respectful of the manifold *qualitative* progress of the race. "The Faith, in which Christianity is embodied, and through which it acts, grows as humanity grows," commending itself to the ἡγεμονικοὶ καὶ παιδευτικοὶ of each successive generation, while its facts remain unchanged and its principles are final. Westcott, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 44, ed. 1893, Lilly, *On Shibboleths*, p. 47, ed. 1892. "Revelation was, and must be, *progressive*," since "Christ

teaching doctrines not to be found in Scripture, but to the Creeds taught to Christians, and confessed by them at their Baptism[1]. This ancient idea of the Rule of Faith teaches us to decline with emphatic decision doctrines which lack any Scripture warrant, and which came to prevail, and then only partially, in a later age of the Church[2].

ii. *The Canonical Scriptures.*

xi. **The Canon.** Having laid down the plenary authority of Holy Scripture in matters of doctrine, the Article proceeds to deal with the vexed question of the Canon, and to define the extent and limits of Holy Scripture. The Holy Scriptures, it states, are comprised in those Canonical Books, both of the Old and New Testaments, of whose authority, that is, in matters of faith, was never any doubt in the Church. The word "Canon," having passed through various meanings[3], was used in the

came to be the *Object* of a revelation, not merely to make one." Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, i. pp. 125, 126, quoting E. B. Pusey.

[1] Bp Browne *on the Articles*, pp. 143, 144; Dr Pusey *On the Rule of Faith*, *University Sermons*. While the Anglican Church accepts a Hermeneutical and Ecclesiastical Tradition "she seeks to protect the faithful against the enforcement on them, *as requisite to salvation*, of individual opinions, which being without the authentication of Church authority, have consequently no Scriptural authority. Any accretive development, that would add to the substance of the faith, would be condemned by this Article, but it would not condemn the enunciation by legitimate authority of any doctrine deduced from the original deposit." Bp Forbes, pp. 98, 99.

[2] "Where an opinion has been held commonly in Christendom for a while and then abandoned, without being explicitly condemned, as being out of harmony with Scripture and reason, like the notion of Christ's offering His death as a ransom to the Devil, then we shall not scruple to reject what lacks *permanent* Church authority and Scriptural basis. Where finally doctrines, lacking any Scriptural warrant, come to prevail only in a later age of the Church, and only partially then, like the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, or of Indulgences on the basis of the Treasury of Merits, doctrines ignored or rejected explicitly in the earlier ages, then, even without condemning them as positively heretical, we shall have no hesitation in declining them with emphatic decision." Gore's *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 66.

[3] For the word Canon see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 10, *n.*; Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 110, *n.*

fourth century to denote the Books admitted and accepted by "the rule" of the Church's judgment, as regulating, to the exclusion of all other books, Christian belief and teaching.

xii. **The Canon of the Old Testament** was inherited by the Christian from the Jewish Church, but it has come down to us in a twofold form :—

(α) We have the Hebrew Canon, containing only the Books which this Article admits to be Canonical. These are the Books which (1) were received by the Jews of Palestine, (2) were quoted by our Lord and His Apostles, and (3) are accepted by modern Jews[1].

(β) We have the Septuagint or Greek Version, which contains, besides the generally accepted Scriptures, certain other Books, which were incorporated with the Books of the Hebrew Canon, and so claimed to be equally inspired.

Up to the date of the Council of Trent the question of the Canon was open, and the single great exception to the opinion of the early Fathers, who accepted the Hebrew Canon, was that of S. Augustine[2]. This Father includes in the Canon of Scripture those additional Books found in the Septuagint Version, and his enlarged Canon was adopted at the Council of Carthage A.D. 397. While the Reformed Communities accepted only the Hebrew Canon as having any real weight in establishing matters of faith, the Council of Trent, though not without opposition,

The word was first used to designate the Holy Scriptures by S. Athanasius, who speaks of "this definite body of writings as canonized, that is, accepted."

[1] During the first four centuries this Hebrew Canon is the only one which is distinctly recognised, and it is supported by the combined authority of those Fathers, whose critical judgment is entitled to the greatest weight.

[2] See the famous passage in his *De Doctrin. Christ.* ii. 8.

pronounced the enlarged Greek Canon, including the Apocryphal Books, to be deserving in all its parts of equal veneration, and added a list of Books to prevent "the possibility of doubt."

xiii. **The Hebrew Canon** of the Old Testament corresponds with our present English Bible, and that it was the one quoted by our Lord and His Apostles may be thus proved. (1) Our present English Old Testament corresponds with the Hebrew Old Testament of the modern Jews; (2) that corresponds with the List given in the Babylonian[1] Talmud of A.D. 550; (3) that with Jerome's Version A.D. 400; (4) that with Origen's Hexapla A.D. 200; (5) that with the Catalogue given by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, A.D. 160; (6) and that with the List of Books supplied by Josephus A.D. 70, who tells us that a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures was preserved in the Temple, and was there till the hour of its destruction, when he was 33 years of age. To the Temple the Jewish historian had ready access, and his testimony as to the contents of this copy is very valuable, for it shows that the Scriptures[2] we now possess are the same as those accepted by the Jews of our Lord's time, and we know on the authority of Philo and of Josephus himself that the Jews "would rather die ten thousand deaths[3]" than suffer any alteration to be introduced into their sacred Books.

[1] See Bp Browne *on the Articles*, p. 148. "The Babylonian Talmud recounts the same Books that we have now; viz. in the Law the Five Books of Moses; among the Prophets, Joshua and Judges, Samuel and Kings, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Isaiah and the twelve minor Prophets; in the Chethubim Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, Esther, Chronicles. This was the Canon of the Jewish Church about A.D. 550."

[2] In the short space which elapsed between our Lord's earthly Ministry and Josephus, no alteration can have taken place in the Canon.

[3] Philo-Judæus *ap. Euseb. Præpar. Evangel.* Lib. viii. 6; comp. Jos. *Antiqq.* xi. 6; v. 17; *Contra Apionem* i. 8.

xiv. **The Canon of the New Testament.** As regards the Books of the New Testament there is no difference between the Church of England and any other branch of the Church in respect to the number of Books that are to be admitted into the Canon. "All the Books of the New Testament," the Article declares, "as they are commonly received, we do receive, and account them Canonical," and this statement is not followed by any list of Books, as in the case of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. The consentient testimony of the Church from the earliest days is thus taken as the ground on which we accept the writings of the New Testament, and recognise their claim to form part of Holy Scripture. The early Church was specially qualified to give security for and to pronounce on the authenticity of the various Books. For

(i) In the first Age of the Church the Apostles were actually alive while the Sacred Books were in process of writing;

(ii) Instead of being hidden away, these Books were publicly used[1], and copies of them were multiplied everywhere;

(iii) Owing to the constant intercourse between the various Churches, it was easy for each Church to know which were the authentic writings and which were not;

(iv) The very schisms and divisions, which took place, made each Church a check upon the others, and thus increased the number of independent witnesses;

[1] Thus Justin Martyr, about A.D. 146, tells us that the Gospels, the "Memorabilia," composed by the Apostles and their companions, were publicly read on the Lord's Day in the assemblies both in town and country. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 67.

(v) In the course of time Collections[1] began to be drawn up of Books acknowledged as Apostolic and authoritative, and "Versions" or Translations began to be made into many languages[2].

xv. **Early Versions.** The oldest example, perhaps, of these Versions is the *Peshitto* or *Syriac Version* of the New Testament. It was probably made for the Syrian Church of Edessa and the neighbourhood about the middle of the second century. In its earliest form it seems to have contained all the Books of our New Testament Canon, with the exception of 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse[3]. This version has an especial interest because its language represents the vernacular spoken in Palestine at the time of the Apostles. Almost contemporary with this ancient Syriac Version was the old Latin Version, the *Vetus Itala*[4]. It was the Bible of the early African Churches, in the north of which country Christianity had been planted very early and had greatly flourished. It contained all the Books of our present Canon, except the Epistle to the Hebrews, James, and 2 Peter. The testimony of these Versions has a special value; because (*a*) they

[1] Of such collections we have a remarkable specimen in the famous Muratorian *Fragment on the Canon*, so called as being first published by Muratori, A.D. 1740, from a MS. in the Ambrosian Library of Milan, which had belonged originally to the great Irish monastery of Bobbio. The date of the original, of which it is a copy, was between A.D. 160—170, and it probably represents the Canon in use among Western Churches at the time of its composition. It contains in its catalogue S. Luke and S. John's Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of S. Paul, 1 and 2 John, Jude and the Apocalypse. It omits the Epistles of James, 3 John, 1 and 2 Peter, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is due probably to the fragmentary and corrupt state of the MS., beginning, as it does, in the middle of a sentence referring to S. Mark's Gospel. See Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 47—53; Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, pp. 115, 116.

[2] See Bp Browne *on the Articles*, p. 165.

[3] See Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 515, 528; Professor Fisher, *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, p. 184.

[4] It was the *Peshitto* or "Simple Version" of the West, habitually used by Tertullian. Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 128.

represent the official and public approbation of Churches; (*b*) they introduce no Apocryphal Book; (*c*) taken together they exclude no Book found in our present Canon except the second Epistle of S. Peter; (*d*) they show how early the need was felt and satisfied of extending to foreign Churches a knowledge of those Greek Apostolic writings, which were regarded as sacred and authoritative[1].

xvi. **The Testimony of Eusebius.** We have not space to do more than allude to the quotations from the New Testament in the writings of the great Fathers of the Church in the East and the West, or to the results of the persecution of Diocletian in A.D. 303[2], which, in spite of the surrender of the Sacred Books in many instances, "left the African Churches in possession of a complete and pure New Testament." We pass on to the important testimony of Eusebius, the historian of the early centuries of the Church. In a celebrated passage of his History (iii. 25) he arranges the sacred writings of the New Testament in three classes; (1) *the Homologoumena*[3], or "Acknowledged Books"; (2) *the Antilegomena*[4], or "Disputed Books"; (3) *the Notha*, or "Spurious Books[5]." This language illustrates the great care and caution exercised in the matter of admitting Books into the Canon. Everyone, who dealt with the question, appealed to usage, tradition, and antiquity,

[1] See *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible*, p. 30.

[2] See Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* viii. 2. The decree for the confiscation of the sacred Christian writings, which constituted an ingenious part of the persecutor's policy, defeated its own purpose; it advertised to the whole world the influence of the acknowledged Christian Scriptures, and forced upon the attention of the Church their infinite superiority as compared with all other ecclesiastical writings.

[3] The "Homologoumena" include (1) The Four Gospels and Acts; (2) Fourteen Epistles of S. Paul; (3) The first Epistle of S. Peter and of S. John; (4) And with a query, the Apocalypse.

[4] The "Antilegomena" included the Epistle of S. James, the second of S. Peter, S. Jude, and the second and third Epistles of S. John.

[5] These included (1) the Acts of Paul; (2) the Shepherd of Hermas; (3) the Apocalypse of Peter; (4) the Epistle of Barnabas. See Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 131.

but not to any definite decree. At length at the Synod of Laodicea A.D. 363, and at the still more important Council of Carthage A.D. 397, a decree was issued respecting the Books of the New Testament, and the question of the Canon, being now taken out of the domain of criticism, was settled by the authority of the Christian Church, and the contents of the New Testament, as we now have them, were formally accepted.

iii. *The Apocrypha*[1].

xvii. **The Apocryphal Books** form part, as we have seen, of the sacred literature of the Alexandrian Jews and are found mingled with the Hebrew Scriptures in the ancient copies of the Septuagint. They are the product of the age subsequent to the Captivity, and had their origin partly in Babylonia, partly in Palestine and Egypt, and possibly in other countries. They belong to the last three centuries before Christ, when prophecy and direct Biblical Revelation had ceased. The New Testament writers, who frequently quote the Alexandrine Version, never make dogmatic use of these writings as Scripture, although they may be supposed to have been not unacquainted with the contents of some of them. The writers of the early

[1] The word Apocrypha is derived from ἀπόκρυφος = *hidden*, or *concealed*. It is really a neuter adjective of the plural number, agreeing with βιβλία, *books*, understood. The word ἀπόκρυφος occurs three times in the New Testament, Mark iv. 22; Luke viii. 17; Col. ii. 3. As applied to βιβλία it denotes (1) *the Hidden Books*, (2) *the Spurious* or *Forged Books*, (3) *the Unrecognised Books*. "The Books that were at first hidden and so unrecognised, were regarded as undeserving to form part of the Sacred Canon. The 'Apocrypha' is popularly supposed to consist of Apocryphal material, and 'Apocryphal' being commonly identified with 'supposititious' or 'fictitious,' it is commonly imagined that the 'Apocrypha' literature is unworthy of thoughtful study. The word 'Apocrypha' originally denoted writings of 'secret character' or 'unknown authorship,' but, from Jerome's day, grew to be the mere label applied to the miscellaneous group of 'ecclesiastical books' that were read in the Churches, but were not included in the strict limits of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture." From a paper of the Rev. Professor Ryle at the Exeter Church Congress, 1894.

Church[1] did not generally follow their example, and the influence of the Greek and Latin Versions, in which no difference was discernible between the Hebrew Books and the Alexandrine additions, naturally predisposed the Church in favour of their use.

xviii. **The Latin Vulgate** naturally did much to extend this use, and still more the conciliar recognition they first received at the third Synod of Carthage, A.D. 397. The Council of Trent established the acceptance as inspired of all Books contained in the Vulgate Version, and declared them to be also of dogmatic authority. The Protestant communities unanimously agreed in accepting only the Hebrew Canon, as having real weight in establishing matters of faith. The judgment, however, which they pronounced, was expressed in varied terms in the different Confessions. In the Lutheran symbols there is found no decided negative, though they do in fact declare the Canonical Books to be alone dogmatically binding[2].

xix. **The English Church,** besides giving a list of the Apocryphal Books, appeals directly to the opinion of S. Jerome[3], and concedes to them a "use for example of life and instruction of manners," but not for the establishment of doctrine. Hence while she has removed them

[1] Even writers like Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Athanasius, who expressly declared their preference for the Hebrew Canon, quote the Books of the Apocrypha as Canonical or Ecclesiastical Scripture. The Homilies make frequent quotations from the Apocrypha. Old Hugh Latimer appeals to the examples of life presented by the "Lady Judith" and the "Lady Susanna."

[2] "Libri Apocryphi, quos quidem ecclesia legere et ex iis documenta de rebus cum libris Canonicis consentientibus desumere potest; at nequaquam ea ipsorum vis et auctoritas est, ut ex ullo testimonio ipsorum aliquod dogma ...certo constitui possit." *Conf. Gall.* iii. 4; *Conf. Belg.* vi.

[3] Hieron. *in Libros Salomonis.* "Sicut ergo Judith et Tobit et Maccabæorum Libros legit quidem Ecclesia, sed inter Canonicas Scripturas non recipit, sic et hæc duo volumina (i.e. Libros Sapientiæ et Ecclesiastici) legit ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem Ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam."

from the Sunday Services[1], and forbidden them to be quoted as of dogmatic authority, yet she regards them as of high value[2] for the information they contain[3], for the respect they have received from the earliest ages, for the important links which they supply between the Old and New Testaments, and for the light they throw upon several customs and circumstances alluded to in the Gospels and Epistles[4].

[1] On the question of reading the Apocrypha in Church see Hooker *Eccl. Pol.* v. 20, 7, and the quotation he gives from Rufinus in *Symb. Apost.* 38. Passages from Tobit and Wisdom are quoted as Scripture in the Homilies, and sentences from Tobit are still retained in our Communion Office. According to the New Lectionary though passages in Ecclesiasticus, Wisdom, and Baruch are appointed to be read between Oct. 27 and Nov. 18 and on certain Saints' Days, The Story of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon, and other parts have been eliminated. It is to be noticed that the English Church includes among the *Apocrypha* 1, 2 *Esdras*, and the *Prayer of Manasses*, which are not reckoned in the Canon by the Council of Trent.

[2] It is to be noticed that the Article assumes the Apocrypha to be amongst the "Biblia" or Scriptures by referring to them as "the other Books," only carefully distinguishing them as the Non-Canonical or Ecclesiastical Scriptures from the Canonical Scriptures, and explaining the proper authority of each kind of Sacred Writing.

[3] The Apocryphal Books "set before the Church in vivid pictures the working of the old Dispensation throughout the Jewish world at times when there was 'no prophet more.' They witness alike to what Judaism could do and to what it could not do. They prove by contrast that the Books of the Hebrew Canon, as a whole, are generically distinct from the ordinary religious literature of the Jews; and establish more clearly than anything else the absolute originality of the Gospel." Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, p. 291.

[4] The Swiss war of Liberty and the Rise of the Dutch Republic are alone comparable for pure patriotism and religious fervour, with the great struggle of the Maccabæan War. Without some knowledge of that struggle, that triumph of Judaism and repulse of Hellenism, the literature, the thought, the history of the Jews in the following century are unintelligible. See Article "Maccabees" in Smith's *Dict. of the Bible.*

Article VII.

1563.	1571.
De Veteri Testamento.	*Of the Olde Testament.*
Testamentum vetus Nouo contrarium non est, quandoquidem tam in veteri quàm nouo, per Christum, qui vnicus est mediator Dei et hominum, Deus et Homo, æterna vita humano generi est proposita. Quare malè sentiunt, qui veteres tantùm in promissiones temporarias sperasse confingunt. Quanquam Lex à Deo data per Mosen, quoad Ceremonias et ritus, Christianos non astringat, neque ciuilia eius præcepta in aliqua Republica necessariò recipi debeant: nihilominus tamen ab obedientia mandatorum, quæ Moralia vocantur, nullus quantumuis Christianus est solutus.	The olde Testament is not contrary to the newe, for both in the olde and newe Testament euerlastyng lyfe is offered to mankynde by Christe, who is the onlye mediatour betweene God and man, being both God and man. Wherefore they are not to be hearde whiche faigne that the olde fathers dyd looke onlye for transitorie promises. Although the lawe geuen from God by Moyses, as touchyng ceremonies and rites, do not bynde Christian men, nor the ciuile preceptes therof, ought of necessitie to be receaued in any common wealth: yet notwithstandyng, no Christian man whatsoeuer, is free from the obedience of the commaundementes, whiche are called morall.

i. Connection. The Sixth Article treated of the Bible as a whole, and of the Canonical Scriptures as possessed of dogmatic authority. The present Article deals with the relation of the Old Testament to the New. Upon this point there was much difference of opinion in the Sixteenth Century. Many of the Anabaptists, not only on the continent but even in England, held that there was no connection between the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments[1]. They taught that the prophets wrote only

[1] "Multi nostris temporibus inveniuntur, inter quos Anabaptistæ præcipue sunt collocandi, ad quos si quis vetus Testamentum alleget, illud pro abrogato jam et obsoleto penitus habent, omnia quæ in illo posita sunt ad prisca majorum nostrorum tempora referentes." *Reform. Leg. Eccl. de Heresibus*, c. 4.

for the people of the old Dispensation; that their doctrine pertained only to their own time; and that the moral Law was not binding on Christian men[1]. They thus denied that the Jewish system was vitally connected with the Christian, and affirmed that the men of old time looked for no more than transitory promises, and had not even the faintest expectation of a life beyond the present[2].

ii. **History and Language.** The original title of the Article in 1553 was "The Old Testament is not to be refused," and the Article consisted only of the first two clauses. The present third clause formed a portion of the old Nineteenth Article, which was entitled, "All men are bound to keep the moral commandments of the Law." This was transposed to its new position as the concluding clause of the Seventh Article in 1563.

iii. **Analysis.** The Article consists of three parts:—

(1) It states that "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New," and gives the reason for this view;

(2) It affirms that they are not to be listened to, who pretend that "the old fathers did look only for transitory promises";

(3) It declares that though the Law given to Moses does not bind Christian men as regards rites and ceremonies, and although "the civil precepts thereof ought not of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from obedience to the Commandments which are called Moral."

[1] Herein they renewed the errors of Basilides, Carpocrates, and the Manichæans.

[2] See Alley, *Poore Mans Librarie*, ii. 97; *Homilies*, 2nd Part of Faith, p. 38, Camb. Ed.

iv. **Proof of the first Statement:**—The first Statement thus put forward may be proved (*a*) from the testimony of the Scriptures themselves, and (*β*) from that of the early Fathers.

i. *The testimony of the Scriptures.*

(*a*) The Authority of the Old Testament is distinctly acknowledged in the New. Our Lord Himself repeatedly quotes the Old Testament, and He said to the Jews of His day, *Ye search the Scriptures*[1], i.e. the Scriptures of the Old Covenant, *and these are they which bear witness of Me* (John v. 39);

(*b*) Christ is ever represented as the Centre and Meeting-point of both Testaments[2], and while the Old Testament points onward to Him as destined to come, the New Testament proclaims Him as actually come[3];

[1] Ἐρευνᾶτε=*search*, or, better, *ye search* (see R.V.), *τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ.* The reproach here lies not in their searching the Scriptures, but in their searching to so little purpose. Ὑμεῖς is emphatic because ye are the people who think that in them ye have eternal life, "quia *vos* putatis in ipsis vitam æternam habere" Vulg.

[2] Comp. Heb. i. 1, 2 where God, *Who of old time spake unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners* is declared to have *spoken unto us at the end of these days in His Son.* The teaching of the Old Revelation was conveyed *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, multifariam multisque modis* (Vulg.), in successive portions, and in varying fashions according to the needs and capacities of those who received it. "The former revelation was given *of old time*, in the infancy and growth of the world: the Christian Revelation *at the end of these days*, on the very verge of the new order which of necessity it ushered in." Bp Westcott on Heb. i. 2.

[3] Or as S. Augustine puts it in well-known words "Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet, Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet." "Ante adventum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi," writes the same Father, "quo humilis venit in carne, præcesserunt justi, sic in Eum credentes venturum quomodo nos credimus in Eum qui venit. Tempora variata sunt, non fides...alium sonum habet 'venturus est,' alium sonum habet 'venit'; eadem tamen fides utrosque conjungit, et eos qui venturum esse, et eos qui Eum venisse crediderunt." S. Aug. *Tract.* xlv. *in Joann.*

(*c*) The Old Testament Dispensation proved, in the words of S. Paul, *a tutor*[1] to bring men to Christ, and this it did in two ways, (1) by prophecy, (2) by types and symbols.

(1) *By prophecy:—*

(*a*) The first promise of a Saviour is the starting-point of the History of Redemption, and irradiates the gloom of the Fall (Gen. iii. 15). In terms the Promise was quite indefinite. Neither the time, nor the method, nor the precise mediating cause of man's deliverance was made known. It was not revealed whether the Promised Seed should be one or many, the collective race or a single deliverer[2]. But in process of time it was restricted through one of the sons of Noah to the *race* of Shem (Gen. ix. 26, 27); through Abraham to a particular *nation*, that of his descendants, the Jews (Gen. xii. 2, 3)[3]; through one of the sons of Jacob to a particular *tribe*, that of Judah[4] (Gen. xlix. 9, 10).

(*β*) Hitherto no personal trait of the destined Deliverer had been given. This began with

[1] Ὁ *νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστόν* Gal. iii. 24; "*παιδαγωγὸς*, qui nos continuit in disciplina ne elaberemur." Bengel.

[2] "Still with all its uncertainty as to the mode in which this End shall be effected, the promise had within it a principle of *Hope* and *Encouragement*, and the materials of a religious trust fitted to keep man still looking to his Maker." Davison *On Prophecy*, p. 55. The words foretell that man shall overcome the powers of evil, through himself suffering in the conflict. And this was only finally and perfectly fulfilled in the Son of Man.

[3] The specific promise—"in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed"—refers primarily to the nation descended from Abraham as a whole; its perfect fulfilment is seen only in Him, who in His sacred humanity is the perfect Flower of the nation.

[4] The uncertainty of the meaning of the word "Shiloh" here is shewn by the alternatives given in the margin of the Revised Version.

Moses, for when the people terrified at the thunderings and lightnings which accompanied the giving of the Law asked that he would be their mediator, Moses predicted the coming of a greater Prophet and a mightier Lawgiver[1] (Deut. xviii. 15—19). About the same time the unwilling testimony of a heathen seer centres the hopes of the world definitely in Palestine, and the witness of Balaam confirms the promise of the Hebrew Lawgiver (Num. xxiv. 17). When the sceptre rises from Judah, and David sits upon his throne, he himself speaks of the coming of a greater King, *of whose dominion there shall be no end* (Ps. ii.; xlv.; lxxii.; cx.)[2].

(γ) With Isaiah a new class of predictions comes before us. He indicates the birth of the Messiah from a Virgin (Isai. vii. 14), and describes the chief scenes of His opening Ministry (Isa. ix. 1, 2), and foreshadows a most vital aspect of His character and work under the image of "the servant of Jehovah[3]" (Isa. xli. 8 sqq., xlii. 1 sqq.).

[1] This promise received partial fulfilment in the successive members of the great race of prophets whom God sent to His people. But not even the greatest of them was "like unto," i.e. the equal of, Moses. For the expectation of a prophet in our Lord's time see Matt. xvi. 14; Mark vi. 15; Luke ix. 7, 8, 9; John i. 21, 25; vii. 40, 41.

[2] See Westcott's *Introduction to the New Testament*, p. 87; Davison *On Prophecy*, p. 205. We have in Ps. cx. the most vivid presentation of the truth that the expected King is God's vice-gerent.

[3] This is a most vital aspect of the character and work of the true Messiah. The title "Servant of Jehovah" is applied to our Lord by S. Peter Acts iii. 26; iv. 27, 30. "In the last period of his long ministry Isaiah's prediction of the promised Messiah, not as an unoccupied Sovereign of man, but as the Servant of God, toiling, misunderstood, insulted, suffering, yet eventually triumphant, was an inspired picture which could not

When the nation goes into captivity, the very sadness of the exile serves to correct the idea of the promised Messiah, and "the Son of David" gives place in the writings of Daniel to the *Son of Man* (Dan. vii. 13).

(δ) Meanwhile another voice, not jubilant and glad, but sad and mournful begins to be heard. It speaks of triumph, but of triumph through suffering; of the coming of *a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief*, of His being *bruised for our iniquities*, of His being *stricken for the transgressions of His people* (Isai. liii. 3—10). Zechariah again predicts that the Messiah shall be *smitten* (Zech. xiii. 7)[1], and Daniel describes Him as *cut off, but not for Himself* (Dan. ix. 26), while the Psalmist foretells that the kings of the earth *shall set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against His Anointed* (Ps. ii. 2), and how men *shall part His garments among them and cast lots upon His vesture* (Ps. xxii. 18), and *give Him gall for His meat, and in His thirst give Him vinegar to drink* (Ps. lxix. 21)[2].

(2) *By types and symbols:—*

(α) Thus from Moses to Malachi the Hebrew

but leave its mark on the mind of Israel." Liddon's *Advent Sermons*, ii. p. 332.

[1] Zech. xiii. 7 represents the judgment of God as falling for the sake of the people on the King, the Shepherd of the people, Whom He has brought into close fellowship with Himself. The passage is directly predictive of the Messiah's sufferings; for it is the King suffering, and suffering for His people, that is set before us. Comp. Dan. ix. 26.

[2] See Davison *On Prophecy*, p. 289; Cardinal Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, p. 441.

Scriptures are, as it were, "one long-drawn sigh of sorrowful hope[1]." But while the prophets intimated that the expected Messiah should triumph and yet should die, Moses intimated the same fact by a system of symbolic sacrifices and typical ordinances, which he was commanded to institute[2]. And the same Scriptures, which portray the attributes of the one true God in the purest and most spiritual form, and enounce the simplest and sublimest code of human duties, contain the most minute and elaborate directions respecting the slaughtering of a lamb or other victim, and set forth with equal earnestness the equal necessity of presenting the Burnt Offering, the Sin Offering, and the Peace Offering[3]. Again these Scriptures, while they describe the form of the one everlasting Essence under the veil of attributes that are themselves unfathomable, prescribe day by day, and year by year, a series of visible and impressive services[4], which by their constant repetition and recurrence proclaimed their own inefficacy, and testified that they were

[1] Archer Butler's *Sermons*, Series i. p. 258.

[2] See Pearson *On the Creed*, p. 332; Butler's *Analogy*, Pt. ii. c. v.

[3] See Archer Butler's *Sermons*, Series i. p. 265.

[4] "The nation may be said to possess an outward worship just in order that it may transcend it and look down upon it....Hence the last outcome of the life of the nation was, on the one hand, the Levitical Law which hedged round the life of the Jewish devotee with the minutest prescriptions of outward service and ritual, and, on the other hand, the Book of Psalms, which expresses in language that the highest Christian devotion is glad to accept as its own, the inward yearning of the soul that turns away from all outward forms as empty and worthless, and is content with nothing short of the deepest inward union with God." Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, i. pp. 388, 389, ed. 1893.

possessed only of *a shadow of the good things to come*[1] (Heb. x. 1).

(β) Now we cannot believe that the vast organization of Judaism was instituted to be a preparation for nothing[2], that its complex mode of worship pointed on to no adequate fulfilment of what was typical and transitory. The very nature of the sacrifices of the old Dispensation enshrined a mystery greater than any that can be escaped by denying their predictive import. "Judaism with a typified atonement may be a miracle or a chain of miracles, but Judaism without it is a greater miracle still[3]."

Thus "Expectation" is the inward spirit of the Old Testament[4], and the Scriptures thereof point onwards to One who is revealed in the New, and in both Testaments "everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and man, being both God and man."

[1] "The iteration, the inefficacy, the transitoriness of the services of the Law which culminated in that of the Day of Atonement, followed from the fact that it 'had a shadow only of good things to come.' It could provide nothing more than symbolic, and therefore recurrent, offerings, which in different ways witnessed to an idea they were inadequate to fulfil." Bp Westcott on Heb. x. 1.

[2] See Archbp Trench's *Hulsean Lectures*, pp. 177—192.

[3] "The Hebrew Scriptures themselves and the people and polity which form their singular subject, intimate a wonderful *future*, and point altogether to it, and are wholly inexplicable unless on the supposition of it. This at once distinguishes it from every other ancient writing of the same kind; among all national literature this makes the Jewish unique." Archer Butler's *Sermons*, Series i. p. 256.

[4] Archer Butler's *Sermons*, Series i. pp. 261, 262. On our Lord's claim to be the fulfilment of these predictive rites, see Liddon, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 79, 117.

ii. *The testimony of the early Fathers.*

The testimony of the early Fathers may be thus arranged:—

(*a*) Ignatius affirms that "the prophets preached the Gospel, hoping in Christ and waiting for Him[1]";

(*b*) Justin Martyr says that "in the Books of the Prophets we find Jesus Christ foretold as born of a Virgin, healing diseases, crucified, dead, rising again, and ascending into heaven[2]."

(*c*) Irenæus declares that "the Law began in the time of Moses, and ended with John the Baptist, when Christ came to fulfil it[3]";

(*d*) Origen writes, "the same Providence, which heretofore gave the Law, afterwards gave the Gospel, not being willing to retain the rites and ceremonies of the Jews, but destroying their city and temple[4]";

(*e*) Tertullian testifies that "the Church mingles the Law and the Prophets with the Evangelical and Apostolical writings, and thence drinks in faith[5]";

(*f*) S. Augustine speaks of the Old Testament as "a Prophecy of the New, so that the holy Patriarchs and Prophets had the hope of eternal salvation therein[6]."

[1] *Ep. ad Phil.*, c. v.; *ad Magn.*, c. x.

[2] *Apol.* i. c. 31; *Dial. cum Tryph.*, c. xi.

[3] Iren. *Adv. Hær.*, Bk. iv. cap. 4.

[4] Origen, *Contr. Celsum*, vii. 26.

[5] "Ecclesia Legem et Prophetas cum Evangelicis et Apostolicis litteris miscet et inde potat fidem." Tertull. *De Præscrip.*, xxxvi.

[6] S. Aug. *Contra Faust. Manich.*, xv. 2.

v. **Proof of the second Statement** that "the old Fathers did not look only for transitory promises." This may be shewn

(1) From the language of our Lord;
(2) From that of the Epistle to the Hebrews;
(3) From the words of the Old Testament itself.

(*a*) *The language of our Lord*:—

Besides constantly quoting the Old Testament Scriptures to establish truths of eternal import:

(i) He expressly asserts respecting them *These are they*[1] *which bear witness of Me* (John v. 39);

(ii) He says to the Jews, *If ye believed Moses, ye would believe on Me, for he wrote of Me*[2] (John v. 46);

(iii) He affirms respecting Abraham, *Your father Abraham rejoiced to see My day, and he saw it and was glad*[3] (John viii. 56);

(iv) After His Resurrection He spends an entire Easter afternoon in interpreting to the two on the road to Emmaus *in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself* (Luke xxiv. 27).

[1] Ἐκεῖναι = "they," "precisely they," the very Books of the Old Covenant, which the Jews so diligently studied, "*testify of Me.*" "The scriptures witnessed of One whom the Jews rejected; they pointed to a life which the Jews would not seek. There is a deep pathos in the simple coordination: *and,...and.*" Bp Westcott on John v. 39.

[2] Εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωυσῇ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί = *If ye believed Moses* (not *if ye had believed*), *ye would believe Me.* The tenses are imperfects not aorists. *Si enim crederetis Moysi, crederetis forsitan et Mihi.* Vulg. Disbelief in Moses involved disbelief in Christ. Westcott, *in loc.*

[3] Ἠγαλλιάσατο, *exulted*, rejoiced with the joy of exultation in his eager desire, in his confident hope *to see My day, and he saw it and was glad.* When this was we cannot exactly say. "All conjecture," remarks Bp Westcott, "must be uncertain, but there is nothing unnatural in the supposition that the faith shewn in the offering up of Isaac may have been followed by some deeper, if transient, insight into the full meaning of the promises then renewed. Such faith was in itself, in one sense, a vision of the day of Messiah."

Thus Abraham and Moses, the representatives respectively of the Patriarchal and Legal Dispensations, are declared, the one to have "exulted" in anticipation of the coming of our Lord, and the other to have "written" of Him. This involves on their part not hope only in the transitory promises of this life, but implicit belief in the Divine Promise respecting the future, and thus S. Paul could justly tell Timothy that those Scriptures of the Old Testament, which he had known from a child, *were able to make him wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus* (2 Tim. iii. 15).

(β) *The language of the Epistle to the Hebrews:—*

The writer of this Epistle,

(α) After describing the faith of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, says, *These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them and greeted them from afar, and having confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth*[1]. *For they that say such things*[2] *make it manifest that they are seeking after a country of their own*[3]. *And if indeed they had been mindful of that country, from which they went out, they would have had opportunity to return. But now they desire a*

[1] "The three thoughts rise in natural succession. (α) They saw the promises in their actual fulfilment: (δ) they welcomed the vision with joy though it was far off: (ε) they confessed what must be the true end of God's counsel." Bp Westcott on Heb. xi. 13.

[2] Comp. Gen. xxiii. 4; xlvii. 9. The language of the patriarchs "shewed that they continued to the last to look for what they had not attained. As 'strangers' (ξένοι, comp. Eph. ii. 12), they acknowledged that they were in a foreign land; as 'sojourners' (παρεπίδημοι, comp. 1 Pet. i. 1; ii. 11), that they had no permanent possession, no rights of citizenship. At the same time they kept their trust in God. Their natural fatherland had lost its hold upon them. They waited for a 'city' of God's preparing." Bp Westcott and Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] Πατρίς. Rare in the LXX. this word is found in John iv. 44, and the parallels, but here only in the Epistles.

better country, that is, a heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed of them, to be called their God: for He hath prepared for them a city[1] (Heb. xi. 13—16);

(β) Again he says that *Moses accounted the reproach of Christ*[2] *greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he looked*[3] *unto the recompense of reward* (Heb. xi. 26);

(γ) Once more, after speaking of the terrible sufferings of many of the saints of the Old Testament, he says that they *were tortured, not accepting their deliverance: that they might obtain a better resurrection* than the earthly life, which they might have retained by the acceptance of the offered deliverance (Heb. xi. 35).

Now they who "desire a better country, that is, a heavenly"; they who "despise the pleasures of sin and choose through life rather to suffer ill-treatment with the people of God"; they who "have their eye fixed on the recompense of reward"; they who "endure torture, not accepting the deliverance placed within their reach, that they may obtain a better resurrection," must certainly have looked for more than transitory promises, even for those of life and immortality[4].

[1] Πόλιν, a Divine Commonwealth. *Paravit illis civitatem.* See the Additional Note on this word, Bp Westcott's Appendix to Heb. xi. 10.

[2] Τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Heb. xi. 26) = *the reproach of Christ.* "This reproach, which was endured in the highest degree by Christ Jesus (Rom. xv. 3) was endured also by those who in any degree prefigured or represented Him, those, that is, in whom He partially manifested and manifests Himself, those who live in Him and in whom He lives." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

[3] Ἀπέβλεπε γὰρ εἰς τὴν μισθαποδοσίαν, *aspiciebat in remunerationem.* Vulg. The imperfect has a special emphasis. It was *the habit* of Moses to look away from the things of earth to the Divine recompense for suffering and reproach.

[4] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, pp. 194, 195.

(γ) *The witness of the Old Testament itself.*

In the Old Testament we find eminent saints testifying again and again that they looked for more than transitory promises. Thus

(α) We find the patriarch Job[1], when everything was against him, and he was the most miserable of all objects, saying,

I know that my Redeemer liveth,
And that He shall stand up at the last upon the earth;
And after my skin hath been thus destroyed,
Yet from my flesh shall I see God:
Whom I shall see for myself,
And mine eyes shall behold, and not another[2]
(Job xix. 25—27);

There are difficulties connected with this passage, but this much is clear that Job is convinced of the future adjustment of the contradictions of this life, and sees God Himself appearing as his God or Vindicator, and redeeming him from the unjust ban pressing heavily upon him;

(β) Again we find the patriarch Jacob not only sketching out the fortunes of his sons in the far-

[1] "The Book of Job, whatever date be assigned to it, and whether its contents be regarded as history or parable, is throughout a very hymn of immortality. If this world were all, all was lost for Job; God was a terrible enigma; chance was God; Providence was but a name. But Job in the depth of his anguish *knows* that his Redeemer liveth, and that from his flesh he shall see God." Liddon's *University Sermons*, Series i. p. 113. "In Job we have," writes Professor Mozley, "an instance of a gleam of a future life," "of truth breaking forth in a sudden inspiration before it settles into a doctrine." *Lectures*, p. 50.

[2] "His God, or Vindicator, is *living* and not subject to death—and the satisfaction which God grants him is, that he will behold Him after death—the God who now hides Himself from him, and will not suffer him to approach Him."—Orelli's *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 185.

off future, but predicting the coming of the *Shiloh, unto whom should the obedience of the peoples be* (Gen. xlix. 10);

(γ) Joseph, again, when he too comes to die, does not concentrate his thoughts only on the present, but warns those around him that they were not to find an abiding home in Egypt, and he charges them to carry his bones into the land of promise (Gen. l. 24, 25)[1];

(δ) David also in a well-known Psalm says

Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol;
Neither wilt Thou suffer Thy holy one to see corruption (Ps. xvi. 10);

It is possible that the Psalmist, when he wrote the words, did not understand them in all the fulness of their meaning, yet so far as he himself is concerned, he clearly conceived that there was hope for him beyond the grave[2];

(ε) Once more Isaiah speaks of God as *swallowing up death for ever, and wiping away tears from off all faces* (Isai. xxv. 8), and still more clearly he says

Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust;
For thy dew is as the dew of herbs[3],

[1] "The Faith of Joseph was national at once and personal. He looked forward to the independence of his kindred: and he claimed for himself a share in their future." Bp Westcott on Heb. xi. 22.

[2] "The doctrine of a future life is involved in the Psalmist's faith, though this truth could only be apprehended gradually and through long struggles. For ourselves the words must bear the fuller meaning with which Christ's resurrection has illuminated them. To us they must speak of that 'eternal life,' which is begun here, and is to be consummated hereafter." Prof. Kirkpatrick on Ps. xvi. 10.

[3] Or "the *dew of light*," or "*the light*." "The dew is God's fertilizing gift from heaven, eliciting the riches of the earth...Coming down from the light of heaven God's energy bedews the earth, so that the earth in consequence gives forth the shades, i.e.

And the earth shall cast forth the dead[1] (Isai. xxvi. 19).

These passages, and others too numerous to cite[2], sufficiently prove that the old fathers, judging from their own language, looked beyond the present to a future and abiding reward, and an adjustment of present contradictions.

iii. *The Mosaic Law.*

vi. **The last clause** of the Article affirms that the Moral Law of the Mosaic Covenant is binding upon all Christian men. It rightly regards the Jewish Law under a threefold division, (1) the Ceremonial Law; (2) the Civil Law; and (3) the Moral Law.

(*a*) *The Ceremonial Law:—*

This was a system of types and symbols preparatory for and pointing on to the coming of the Messiah, Who was to fulfil them all. This our Lord did. He fully satisfied every requirement of the Law, and, by His life of perfect obedience and His atoning death upon the Cross, became the Author of a new covenant between God and man, based upon the one all-sufficient sacrifice, and oblation, which He offered once for all for "the sins of the whole world," the adequacy of which He attested when from His Cross He exclaimed τετέλεσται, *It is finished* (John xix. 30). Now, therefore, that the great Antitype has come, the ancient typical sacrifices have *vanished away* (Heb. viii. 13)[3].

the souls of the departed which it hides." Orelli's *Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 303.

[1] Or *the Shades*, Heb. *Rephaim*. See Rev. Version, Margin.

[2] Compare the words of Daniel, *Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt* (Dan. xii. 2).

[3] Compare also Gal. v. 4, the argument of the whole of which Epistle is directed against the observance of the old Jewish Ceremonial Law.

(β) *The Political or Civil Law:—*

This was framed for the special circumstances of one particular nation, when Jehovah condescended to become the exclusive sovereign of the Jewish people. Under such immediate Divine Rule offences against religion became offences against the state[1], and acts of treason which were punishable with death. But this cannot be the case now. Our Lord sits indeed upon His Mediatorial throne, but His is a spiritual dominion and the weapons of His subjects are not carnal. Hence the civil portion of the Mosaic Law is no longer binding and civil punishment cannot be inflicted for religious offences. Forgetfulness of this led the Brownists, the fathers of the Independents, and after them many of the Puritans, to hold that we "are tied unto all the judicials of Moses," and that idolaters, including "contemners of the Word and prayers," should be put to death according to the Mosaic Law[2].

(γ) *The Moral Law:—*

This is of permanent obligation as being founded on the eternal principles of justice and truth. It is not a code of enactments, given for the temporary guidance of a single nation, but a principle of morality for the direction and guidance for all time of rational and accountable beings. The Moral Law, which is God's will[3], is like

[1] Retribution is inherent in the nature of things; it is inevitable; it is in Hegel's words "the other half of crime." "Jussisti enim, et sic est, ut pœna sua sibi sit omnis inordinatus animus." S. Aug. *Confess.* i. 12. Cf. Lilly *On Right and Wrong*, p. 127. To teach this truth to the race through a selected nation in its infancy was part of the purpose of the negative and repressive legislation of the Mosaic Covenant.

[2] See Rogers *on the Articles*. Parker Society. The Pilgrim Fathers enacted some portion of the Mosaic judicial law, and put it in force in their new American settlements with extreme severity.

[3] "The Divine Will bears no arbitrary relation to the Moral Law. God did not create absolute morality; it is coeternal with Himself"; "the shadow does not depend on the mere arbitrary will of the substance for its shape, but on the nature of the substance." See Mansel's *Limits of Religious Thought*,

Himself, holy and perfect, because it reflects His character. In the Sermon on the Mount Christ shows that the Law is not an abstraction merely, but inseparably connected with a living Personality. *Think not*, He says, *that I came to destroy the Law or the prophets; I came not to destroy, but to fulfil* (Matt. v. 17), and He affirms, *Whosoever, therefore, shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven* (Matt. v. 19). Moreover He illustrates His position in reference to the Moral Law by His comments on the Sixth and Seventh Commandments. Of the former He affirms that it forbids not only the murderous deed, but the angry word[1], and of the latter that it forbids impurity not merely in act, but also in look and thought[2]. Thus so far from teaching that under the New Dispensation the Moral Law is done away, He shows that it is still more binding on the Christian than ever it was on the Jew, and that from obedience to it no Christian man whatsoever is free[3].

p. 146; Ward, *The Catholic Revival*, quoting J. H. Newman, p. 217. "The Moral Law is based upon Nature *as God made it*, Nature as the expression of an absolute and Eternal Goodness, the Living Parent of the Universe." Thus "Christus non tradidit Præcepta moralia Positiva, sed Naturalia illa magis explicavit"; and "in its ethical aspect Christianity does not offer a system of morality, but a universal principle of morality which springs out of the Resurrection." See Westcott's *Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 7; Tertull. *De Virg. Vel.* § 1.

[1] Matt. v. 21—24.

[2] Matt. v. 27, 28. Thus our Lord proclaimed the proper essence of morality; goodness, He taught, is goodness of *will*, dependent not on any extrinsic effects, but upon the man's direction of himself to the realisation of a conceived or imagined belief. Cf. Green's *Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 149.

[3] "The standard of Mohammedanism, by contrast to Christianity, may be described as a standard deliberately adapted to the average moral level of the men to whom it was meant to appeal. 'If one had to express in a short compass,' says Professor Mozley, 'the character of its remarkable founder as a teacher, it would be that that great man had no faith in human nature...' 'Human nature is weak,' he said...The method of Christ is in striking opposition. He, before Mohammed, said 'The flesh is weak'; but from the starting-point of this acknowledgment He proceeds by a quite different path. No book exhibits so profound a contempt for majorities, so startling a refusal to consider the conditions of success on the average, as the New Testament. Jesus Christ makes His appeal to the best." Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 206, 207, Ed. 1891.

Article VIII.

1563.	1571.
Symbola tria.	*Of the three Credes.*
Symbola tria, Nicænum, Athanasij, et quod vulgo Apostolicum appellatur, omnino recipienda sunt et credenda. Nam firmissimis Scripturarum testimonijs probari possunt.	The three Credes, Nicene Crede, Athanasius Crede, and that whiche is commonlye called the Apostles Crede, ought throughlye to be receaued and beleued: for they may be proued by most certayne warrauntes of holye scripture.

i. **Connection.** From the Bible the Articles pass on to the three Creeds, which serve as a guide in reading the Holy Scriptures, and gather up in the logical form of Doctrine the truths, which the Bible reveals in the popular form of life and fact[1].

ii. **The Object** of the Eighth Article is to assert the Catholic and conservative character of the English Reformation[2], to show that the aims of those chiefly concerned in it had never been to found a novel Church, or system of their own, or to break away from the rest of Christendom, but to follow in the footsteps of the Primitive Church, and

[1] See Westcott's *Historic Faith*, pp. 22, 23.

[2] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 245. "As touching the chief and principal articles of our faith, sith it is thus agreed as hereafter followeth by the whole clergy of this our realm, we will that all bishops and preachers shall instruct and teach our people, by us committed to their spiritual charge, that they ought and must most constantly believe and defend all those things to be true, which be comprehended in the whole body and canon of the Bible, and *also in the three Creeds or Symbols*." Art. I. of the X. Articles of 1536.

to vindicate and re-affirm the truths of Christianity, as they were current in the purest days of the Faith[1].

iii. **Analysis.** The Article consists of two parts:—

(i) First it states that the three Creeds "ought thoroughly to be received and believed";

(ii) It states the ground for their reception to be, because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."

iv. **The Order** in which the Creeds are enumerated deserves attention. First we have the Nicene Creed, of which it is remarked in the Ten Articles of 1536 that "it is said daily in the Mass[2]." Then follows "Athanasius's Creed," which in the Sarum Breviary was appointed to be sung daily at Prime, after the Psalms and before the Prayers[3]. Last of all we have "that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed," "the common Creed," as it is termed in the Ten Articles, "which every man useth[4]."

v. **Origin of Creeds.** The first preaching of the Gospel was not merely a preaching of love or of exalted morality, but of a series of supernatural facts, having refer-

[1] See Hardwick's *History of the Articles*, p. 10.

[2] Procter's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 247, Ed. 1889. In the Roman Breviary it is appointed to be used on Sundays only.

[3] See Procter's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 245, 248; Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, i. p. 303. The number of times appointed for the recitation of the "Quicunque Vult" was not altered till 1549. Then it was appointed to be used on the six Festivals of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity. In 1552 seven Saints' days were added to these six festivals; so that this *Confession of our Christian Faith* should be used at intervals of about a month throughout the year.

[4] "For nearly three centuries and a half the Apostles' Creed has held its place in the Book of Common Prayer as the Creed of Baptism, of the Catechism, and of the daily offices. Even in the Middle Ages it was known to a relatively large number of the English laity through the instructions of the Clergy and the versions circulated in Primers. The English Reformers inherited a reverent esteem for the *Credo*, and gave it in their new Order of 1549 a place of honour equal to that which it held in the Breviary and the Manual." Prof. Swete, *The Apostles' Creed in its Relation to Primitive Christianity*, p. 9.

ence to the Person and Work of our Lord and Saviour. He Himself before His Ascension gave His Apostles a *Formula*, intended both for actual use and as a basis of instruction (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). This Formula became the model and suggested the outline of the ancient Creeds[1], which in time became not only a source of definite instruction, but the *Symbolum* or Watchword, by which the true soldier of Christ was distinguished from those, who did not believe in Him. The Eastern and Western Churches, while they, each and all, made the Baptismal Formula, as taught by our Lord, the ground-work of the Creeds[2], developed the Articles of their belief each in its own way and reflected therein the respective characteristics of Eastern and Western Christianity[3].

vi. **The Nicene Creed** is not only the most ancient, but the only one of the three Symbols of doctrine, which, with the exception of a single clause[4], is acknowledged alike by the Greek, the Latin, and the Anglican Churches, and the various Communities which have broken off from the Roman centre. The constant repetition of this Symbol in the Eucharistic Office arose in the Eastern Church as a safeguard against the Arian heresy, and from the East gradually passed into the Churches of the West. To this day it is "sung or said" in all countries of the civilized world, and so long as faith in the eternal Deity of Christ lives, it will be regarded with reverence and with gratitude[5].

[1] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 9, 10.

[2] "The Baptismal Creed rests upon the Baptismal words. It was the answer of the Church to the Lord's final revelation of the Name of God. 'As we are baptized, so (writes S. Basil) must we believe'; *δεῖ ἡμᾶς βαπτίζεσθαι μὲν ὡς παρελάβομεν, πιστεύειν δὲ ὡς βαπτιζόμεθα.*" Professor Swete, *The Apostles' Creed*, p. 19.

[3] See the *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 41, 42, 43.

[4] On the *Filioque* clause see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 32, and p. 206 *n.*

[5] Schaff's *History of the Creeds*, ii. p. 652. "At this day, after fifteen centuries have passed away, from one

vii. **The Quicunque vult,** or "Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius," has been the subject of much discussion. It is now generally agreed that the tradition, which ascribed it to this great Eastern father[1], must be abandoned as untenable. It is manifestly a Latin and not a Greek composition, written in Gaul[2] by a student of S. Augustine's teaching, who was so steeped in the spirit of his works, that he has in some clauses reproduced his expressions word for word[3]. It was not set forth by any General Council; it was never used as a Baptismal Creed. Indeed it is not so much a Creed, as an *Expositio Symboli*, or exposition of the doctrines of the Apostles' Creed, and was intended at first for the use and instruction of the Clergy, and afterwards was gradually adopted in the Church as a Canticle or "Creed Hymn," expressing the Catholic Faith on the great subjects of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God[4]. This places it in the same list with such compositions as the *Te Deum*, which is likewise a Creed in the form of a Psalm[5].

viii. **Structure.** As to its structure it is neither more nor less than an enlargement of the Western Formula, the so-called "Apostles' Creed[6]." It consists of three parts:

extremity of the civilized world to the other, in the lonely hamlets of the Alps, in unknown isles of the ocean discovered by modern science, when the solemnity of the Sunday lifts towards heaven brows bent earthward by labour, is heard a concert of rustic voices repeating in one and the same tone this Hymn of the Divine Unity: I believe in one God the Father Almighty," etc. De Broglie, *L'Église et l'Empire Romain au 4ième siècle*, ii. p. 68, quoted by Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, pp. 136, 137.

[1] No Greek copy of it is known to exist earlier than A.D. 1200, and it is nowhere found in the genuine writings of Athanasius or of his contemporaries.

[2] Its doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Spirit would alone suffice to mark its Western origin.

[3] For the parallel passages see Waterland's *Critical History*, pp. 176—191; see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 36.

[4] See Procter's *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 246.

[5] See the *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 38.

[6] Dr Heurtley's *History of the Earlier Formularies of Faith*, p. 118.

(*a*) The First Part, Articles 1—26, contains the Augustinian doctrine respecting the Blessed Trinity; (*b*) The Second, Articles 27—35, contains a summary of the doctrine regarding the nature of our Lord as laid down at the Council of Chalcedon, and guards the great verity of His Incarnation from the perversions of heresy; (*c*) The remainder of the Formula, Articles 36—42, repeats Articles iv., v., vi., vii. of the Apostles' Creed nearly in the very words of the latter; it omits Articles ix. and x., there being no controversy with regard to the subjects they touch upon, while in Articles xi. and xii. it expresses itself in fuller and more precise language than we find used in the more familiar Creed.

ix. **The Apostles' Creed,** which is named last in the Article, was constantly repeated in the mediæval office of Matins, Prime, and Compline, but, unlike the Athanasian Creed, was said together with the Lord's Prayer privately by the Choir before the Lections at Matins, and inaudibly by the priest at the beginning of the Prayers at Prime and Compline[1]. It is the product of the Western Catholic Church within the first four centuries, but it is not till A.D. 750 that we find it in a shape entirely identical with our present formula. "The basis of this document, the local Creed of the early Church of Rome, is substantially a product of the second century. But the Churches which derived their faith from Rome, or acknowledged the primacy of the Roman See, felt themselves under no obligation to adhere to the letter of the Roman Creed; and it received at their hands not only verbal changes, but important additions, involving in some cases new Articles of belief. The process was gradual, and some of the new

[1] Procter, *Hist. Common Prayer*, p. 248.

clauses do not appear before the sixth century, whilst others are as late as the seventh[1]."[2]

x. **The term Symbolum Apostolorum** or Apostolicum was originally "the designation not of one formulary, as distinguished from others, but of the Creeds generally. It implied that the doctrine set forth, though not necessarily couched in the very words delivered by the Apostles, was at least Apostolic doctrine, such as the Apostles taught, such as they handed on. But when distinctive names came to be given to particular Formularies, 'Symbolum Nicænum,' 'Symbolum Constantinopolitanum,' then the Western Formulary, which hitherto had had no distinctive name, retained the appellation which had once been common to all, and which thus became itself distinctive[3]." The idea that it received its name from the fact that, before they set forth on their several Missions, each one of the Apostles contributed to it an Article, rests on no authority. It received its name mainly owing to the causes just stated, and also, perhaps, because, as the Church of Rome was the only Church in the West certainly deemed to have been founded by an Apostle, and its See was called the *Apostolic See*, so its Creed was known as the *Apostolic* or *Apostles' Creed*[4].

xi. **Ground of reception of the Creeds.** Of these Creeds the Article says they are "thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture." Here we have another illustration of the profound reverence for the Bible, as the inspired Word of God and the sole authority for doctrine, which is so dominant a feature of the Articles[5]. There is throughout a special jealousy for the

[1] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 23.
[2] Professor Swete's *Apostles' Creed*, pp. 15, 16.
[3] Heurtley's *History of the Earlier Formularies of Faith*, pp. 8, 9.
[4] See Bishop Browne *On the Articles*, p. 215.
[5] See Bp Forbes *On the Articles*,

authority of Holy Scripture, and here it is once more set forth as the one Rule of Faith. The Church of England does not claim acceptance for the Creeds simply on the ground that they have been handed down by the Church, but because they agree with the teaching of Holy Scripture[1]. Scripture and the Creeds thus stand in mutual relation to each other[2]. Those truths, which the Bible sets forth in the popular form of life and fact, the Creeds gather up in the logical form of doctrine. They mark out the great verities, which the Church believes the Scriptures to teach, and guard them against arbitrary interpretation by individuals or particular bodies of professed believers[3]. The Bible is thus regarded as the sole *Source* of the Rule of Faith; the Creeds *witness* to the Church's interpretation of the Bible, with which they must agree, and beyond which they cannot go[4].

p. 91. The source of error, says Pope Leo in his famous Tome, is that when men are "hindered by some obscurity in knowing the truth, they run not to Prophets, or Apostles, or Evangelists, but to themselves"; they will not "labour in the broad field of Holy Scripture." S. Leo, *Ep.* xxviii. 1, 2.

[1] "The Bible is the sole source of the faith: the Church is the interpreter. The Church is the primary teacher of the truth to her children, but she sends them to the Scriptures to verify it for themselves." Gore's *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 58.

[2] In other words the Church, as the interpreter of Scripture, can only interpret what is "read therein." "Jesus Christ, says the Gospel in every page, is the Son of God.....I ask of the Church's authority what is the sense of this word Son of God? and the Church answers me with a voice, which has always been the same for eighteen hundred years: that the expression has to be taken in its most absolute sense,...in the sense of a perfect filiation, which places the Son on an equality of wisdom, power, virtue, majesty and glory with God the Father." Didon, *Belief in the Divinity of Jesus Christ*, p. 69, E. T. ed. 1894.

[3] "Dogma is not a substitute for truth, but a guide to its apprehension. To accept a dogma on the Church's external authority is only the first step to apprehending it for ourselves." Gore's *R. C. Claims*, p. 68.

[4] "The decisions of Nicæa simply express in a new form, without substantial addition, the Apostolic teaching as it is represented in the New Testament. They express it in a new form for protective purposes, as a legal enactment protects a moral principle. They are developments only in the sense that they represent the Apostolic teaching worked out into formulas by the aid of a terminology which was supplied by Greek dialectics....The Apostolic language is a mine from which, first taught and guided by the Creed of the Church, we can draw a continual and inexhaustible wealth of positive teaching." Gore's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 96, 97, Ed. 1891.

GROUP III.

ARTICLES IX.—XVIII.

The Articles in this Group deal with Men as individuals, and the Divine Plan for their salvation.

They treat of

(*α*) The nature of Original Sin (Art. ix.), its effect on the human will, and the need of divine Grace (Art. x.); the ground of man's Justification before God (Art. xi.), and the true value of Good Works, whether following (Art. xii.) or preceding Justification (Art. xiii.);

(*β*) The impossibility of Works of Supererogation (Art. xiv.), for none has escaped the universal corruption of sin, save our Lord, "the Lamb without spot" (Art. xv.), Who came to take away the sin of the world, and can cleanse from all sin, even that committed after Baptism (Art. xvi.);

(*γ*) The Scriptural Doctrine of Predestination, and its relation to the eternal purpose of God (Art. xvii.), Who wills to connect man's salvation not, in the way of Nature, with any law or sect a man professeth, but in the way of Grace with the all-meritorious sacrifice of His Blessed Son (Art. xviii.).

ARTICLE IX.

1563.

Peccatum Originale.

Peccatum originis non est (vt fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium et deprauatio naturæ cuiuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati, qua fit, vt ab originali iustitia quàm longissime distet, ad malum sua natura propendeat, et caro semper aduersus spiritum concupiscat. Vnde in vnoquoque nascentium, iram Dei atque damnationem meretur. Manet etiam in renatis hæc naturæ deprauatio; qua fit, vt affectus carnis, græce *φρόνημα σαρκὸς*, (quod alij sapientiam, alij sensum, alij affectum, alij studium carnis interpretantur) legi Dei non subjiciatur. Et quanquàm renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio, peccati tamen in sese rationem habere concupiscentiam fatetur Apostolus.

1571.

Of originall or birth sinne.

Originall sinne standeth not in the folowing of Adam (as the Pelagians do vaynely talke) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of euery man, that naturally is engendred of the ofspring of Adam, whereby man is very farre gone from originall ryghteousnes, and is of his owne nature enclined to euyll, so that the fleshe lusteth alwayes contrary to the spirite, and therefore in euery person borne into this worlde, it deserueth Gods wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remayne, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the luste of the fleshe, called in Greke *φρόνημα σαρκός*, which some do expounde the wisdome, some sensualitie, some the affection, some the desyre of the fleshe, is not subiect to the lawe of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that beleue and are baptized: yet the Apostle doth confesse that concupiscence and luste hath of it selfe the nature of synne.

i. **Connection.** Having dealt with the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity and the Rule of the Faith, the Articles pass on to consider in the third group the practical aspects of the Christian Faith, especially as it relates to individuals, and the all-important subject of their salvation.

ii. **Origin.** The Ninth Article is derived from the

Second Article of the Augsburg Confession of 1530, through the medium of the Thirteen Articles of 1538[1].

iii. **Object.** Its object is to oppose a form of misbelief, which troubled the Church in the Fifth, and was revived by the Anabaptists in the Sixteenth Century. That it refers to the teaching of the latter sectaries is clear from the original wording of the Article in 1553. For, after the words "as the Pelagians do vainly talk," the following addition was made, "which also the Anabaptists do nowadays renew."

iv. **The Teaching of Pelagius.** As regards the earlier of these forms of misbelief, Pelagius, an Irish[2] monk of the fifth century, together with Cœlestius, an ardent disciple, with whom he became acquainted at Rome, propagated the doctrine that

(*a*) Adam was by nature mortal, and would have died in the course of time, even if he had not sinned[3];

(*b*) That every man is born pure, and falls from original righteousness as Adam did, by imitating the example which he set;

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 62 and 375.

[2] S. Jerome speaks of him as coming of the Scottish race (*habet progeniem Scoticæ gentis de Britannorum vicinia*), which may imply that he was an Irishman, the Scoti being at that time settled in Ireland. Smith's *Dict. Biog.* Article *Pelagius*. The principal dates connected with him are the following:—(1) Birth about A.D. 370; (2) arrival at Rome, where he meets Cœlestius, A.D. 401; (3) withdraws, in consequence of Alaric's threatened invasion, to Sicily and Hippo in Northern Africa, A.D. 410; (4) present at the Synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis, A.D. 415; (5) condemned by Pope Zosimus in his *Epistola Tractoria*, A.D. 418.

[3] The Pelagians denied altogether the existence of original sin in any real sense as an hereditary moral corruption. They refuse to acknowledge the propagation of sin by generation (*peccatum a traduce*). Sin, they said, is not born with man, but is committed afterwards by man. One of the charges brought against Cœlestius at a Synod held in Carthage A.D. 412 was that he taught "quod infantes qui nascuntur in eo statu sint, in quo fuit Adam ante transgressionem." S. Aug. *de Peccato Orig.* iii. 3. For a summary of Pelagian doctrine see Canon Bright's *Waymarks in Church History*, pp. 185—188.

(*c*) That Adam did not transmit to his descendants any positive stain of sin in consequence of his fall[1].

v. **Revived by the Anabaptists.** These opinions, though strenuously opposed at the time by S. Augustine, and condemned at the Council of Carthage A.D. 418, and by the Council of Ephesus A.D. 431, were revived by the Anabaptists in the sixteenth century and pushed to great extremes.

vi. **Analysis.** The Article, keeping as closely as possible to the words of Scripture,

(i) defines (*a*) what original sin is not, (*b*) what it is;

(*a*) *What it is not:*—

It does not consist in the mere imitation[2] of Adam, in doing the same as he did, as though he had been a copy or example;

(*b*) *What it is:*—

"It is the fault and corruption[3] of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the

[1] Thus S. Augustine quotes Pelagius to the effect that "humano generi primum illud obfuisse peccatum non propagine, sed exemplo"; Pelagius's explanation of his view that infants are not born in sin being "quia isti præceptum capere nondum possunt...nondumque utuntur rationalis voluntatis arbitrio." *De Peccato Orig.* xv. 16.

[2] According to S. Augustine Pelagius affirmed "In Adam peccasse omnes, non propter peccatum nascendi origine contractum, sed propter *imitationem*." *De Nat. et Grat.* ix. 10. Sin, according to this theory, can only be an imitation of Adam's transgression, not a congenital depravity of nature; but if so, argues S. Augustine, why not regard Abel as "caput omnium justorum, quia primus in hominibus justus fuit"? *ut supr.*

[3] Depravatio. From pravus=*twisted, crooked* (comp. Hor. *Sat.* i. 3. 48, where he speaks of a man "pravis fultum male talis," *ill supported on crooked legs*), comes the verb depravare=*to disfigure* or *distort*, and the substantive depravatio=*distortion*, applied sometimes (1) to physical deformity, as "pedum, manuum, articulorum omnium depravationes," Seneca, *Ep.* xxiv.; sometimes (2) to *moral deformity*, or *corruption*, comp. "depravatio et fœditas turpificati animi," Cic. *Off.* iii. 29, 105.

offspring of Adam[1]," and the result of it is threefold:—

(α) "Man is very far[2] gone from original righteousness";

(β) He is "of his own nature inclined to evil";

(γ) "The flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and condemnation."

(ii) Having thus laid down its definition of original sin, the Article next affirms that this "fault or corruption remains even in those that are regenerated, and though there is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin."

vii. **Original Righteousness.** It is admitted on all sides that man, as he originally came forth from the Hands of God, was in body and soul more perfect than any men have been since. But the Churches differ as regards the nature of that primitive perfection. The Roman, Greek, and Reformed Churches all hold that it consisted not only (1) in a state of innocence and freedom from bodily death,

[1] Thus excepting the Incarnation of our Lord from coming under this category, for He was born without any intervention of man in a way wholly miraculous of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary. Comp. S. Aug. *De Pecc. Orig.* xli. 47.

[2] Quam longissimè = *very far*, though not absolutely or entirely. The Assembly of Divines in 1643 preferred the phrase "*wholly* deprived of original righteousness." Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 396. It is evident from Scripture that the image of God in man was not entirely obliterated by the Fall, comp. Gen. ix. 6, 1 Cor. xi. 7. While it is true that "experience shews us that by ourselves we cannot reach it," it is equally true that "we see with increasing clearness, when we contemplate our powers, our aspirations, our failures, an ideal, towards which we are made to strain." Bp Westcott, *The Incarnation and Common Life*, pp. 46, 47.

but (2) in an habitual wisdom and holiness, with immortality of the body. But at this point there comes in a difference of view. The Roman divines regard these advantages as divine gifts of Grace, which were superadded[1] to the natural endowments of man, reason and freewill. The Reformed Churches regard them as natural to and increated in man[2].

viii. **Man's Fall.** But whatever was the nature of man's original condition, his fall is a matter of history, and involved not only himself, but all his progeny, so that men have ever since been born into the world without those prerogatives and endowments which the first human pair possessed before that event took place. The way, however, in which the sin of Adam wrought out its consequences upon mankind, is differently described. While the Catholic Church as a body never taught that the sin of Adam hurt himself alone and not his descendants,

(i) The Greek and Roman Churches consider the effects of the Fall as simply *privative*, and consisting in

(α) The loss of the supernatural gifts of original holiness and immortality;

(β) The enfeebling of the natural powers of man for good[3];

[1] See Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 78.

[2] "Integritas illa, cum qua primus homo conditus fuit et sine qua post ejus lapsum homines omnes nascuntur, non fuit naturalis ejus conditio, sed supernaturalis evectio." Bellarmine *de Gratia primi hom.* 2. Roman theologians distinguish three stages (1) *Status Naturæ Puræ*, a condition in which man lacks alike the empire of reason over his lower passions and the presence of Grace; (2) *Status Naturæ Integræ*, in which there is added the empire of reason; (3) *Status Naturæ Elevatæ*, or *Status Naturæ Protoparentum*, in which there is added Grace, Righteousness, and destination for the Beatific Vision.

[3] Of course it is not implied that this view in any way takes from the heinousness of sin as sin, sin being essentially a matter not of results, but of "disobedience to a Will which I am meant to obey." Maurice, *Epistles of S. John*, p. 47.

(ii) The Reformed Churches on the other hand hold that the results, instead of being simply *privative*, were *actual* and *positive*, that

(α) With the loss of original righteousness there ensued a corruption, more or less entire, of human nature in its spiritual aspect, inclining man to evil and disinclining him to good[1], and

(β) That this transmitted taint, which he inherits, affects him in body, soul, and spirit, and causes that aversion from God of which all are sensible[2].

ix. **The Teaching of the Old Testament.** To the existence of some profound source of disorder in man and the world around him the philosophers and poets alike of the ancient and modern world have borne abundant testimony[3], and the witness of Scripture is no less clear and explicit.

(α) The earliest pages of Genesis inform us that the first human pair were assailed by a supernatural being of unique subtilty and malignity, the enemy of God and of all goodness. Appealing first to Eve he began by insinuating a doubt into her mind respecting the consequences of taking of the forbidden fruit, and then by suggesting the idea of an envious God sapped the foundations of all her trust, and roused an

[1] "Each one is by his nature that which Adam made himself by his act." Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 174.

[2] Actual sin alone is παράβασις, and involves us in personal guilt. Original sin is ἁμαρτία, the missing of perfection, the defect of our nature, the cause of the old heathen proverb, οἱ πλείονες κακοί.

[3] See Mozley's *Lectures* and *Theol. Papers*, p. 145, and the quotations in the *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 250—252; Bp Wordsworth's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 153, 154; Aubrey Moore, *Some Aspects of Sin*, p. 72.

ardent longing for independence[1]. So in an evil hour she *took of the fruit and did eat; and she gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat* (Gen. iii. 1—7);

(*b*) Brief and summary as is the information here given respecting the mystery of the Fall and the inroad of Sin[2], it teaches the all-important truth:—

(*α*) That sin is not a *substance* or *thing*[3];

(*β*) That it did not spring up in man's nature by any inevitable necessity, but came from without, and was the consequence of man's yielding to the seductions of a powerful and malignant foe[4];

(*γ*) That he did not, like his Tempter, choose sin for its own sake[5], but was beguiled into it;

[1] "Evil is simply the disorder introduced into things by the perversity of creatures abusing their freewill and asserting, which is the essence of all sin—*independence of God*." Gore's *Hints for the Study of Theology*, p. 5.

[2] "The one dark, insoluble mystery of human life is sin. It is so impossible for us to explain it; so futile to try and explain it away. It is so terribly familiar, so utterly unintelligible." Aubrey Moore, *Aspects of Sin*, p. 65.

[3] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 248; Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, ii. p. 251 sqq.

[4] "The current and tenour of Revelation is that Sin came from without. It had a history before it entered into the heart of man,—a history of which Holy Scripture contains a few mysterious fragments, but a history that can never be traced out by mortal man, save in its most shadowy outlines. How the first tendency to turn away from the Blessed Face of Almighty God ever originated in Angel or Archangel belongs to the secrets of Eternity. It *did*, however, originate, and sin had in another world its history." Bp Ellicott's *Salutary Doctrine*, pp. 64, 65.

[5] "Satan, our Lord tells us, is not only a *liar*, but the *father of it* (John viii. 44). That is to say, all evil, as an actually existing fact, is to be traced to him. It was he who first gave historical birth to evil, by himself choosing to try it. When and how this was we are not told; we only know that *from the beginning he was a murderer*.... The seduction of man was one stage in his downward career. Having tasted evil himself, he persuaded mankind to do the same, not in the open and direct manner in which he himself had done so, but craftily and subtilly as the serpent form expresses." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 106, 108.

(δ) That hence, though his being was *poisoned* with sin, it was not *converted* into sin, for he was conscious of transgression, and retained an ineradicable sense of shame[1], which made him hide himself from the presence of God[2].

x. **Further Witness of the Old Testament.** But Scripture also teaches us that the fall of the first man did not merely affect himself. He was not a mere individual member of the species like ourselves. All humanity was gathered up in his one person. His fall was the fall of us all. He transmitted to his descendants the sinful tendencies to which he had made himself liable. His sin tainted the stock, and in the wickedness of Cain, who *slew his brother* (Gen. iv. 8; 1 John iii. 12); in the increasing depravity of the Cainite families (Gen. vi. 1—7); in the violence and iniquity which rendered necessary

(*a*) The judgment of the Flood (Gen. vi. 11—13);

(*b*) Then that of the Confusion of Tongues (Gen. xi. 1—9);

(*c*) Then that of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. xix. 12—28);

we have proof that the corruption of man's nature increased

[1] "The image of God is cruelly marred, but not utterly destroyed. The trace of God's likeness is yet visible to Him. When sin drove Adam and Eve from the garden, they were yet within the limits of God's love. Their thoughts turned back to the Paradise they had lost, reached forward to the Promised Seed. This could not have been, if human nature had been ruined by the Fall. Absolute ruin must have been absolute separation from God, which is eternal death." Aubrey Moore, *Some Aspects of Sin*, p. 68.

[2] "All true morality must rest on a certain limitation of the idea of the magnitude of the effect of original sin. If all the higher spiritual faculties be utterly destroyed, how can man really grieve over his shortcomings, if God has deprived him of all power of overcoming and avoiding these shortcomings?" Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 147. "The very Fall in its consummation is so brought about, that it leaves man still man, and therefore still retaining essentially God's image." Bp Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, p. 195.

in intensity as time went on, and that *every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually* (Gen. vi. 5). What we find in these early portions of the Old Testament, we find also in the later. Thus the Psalmist says, *Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me* (Ps. li. 5); Isaiah says, *All we like sheep have gone astray; we have returned every one to his own way* (Isai. liii. 6); and Jeremiah declares, *The heart is deceitful above all things and it is desperately sick; who can know it?* (Jer. xvii. 9, R.V.).

xi. **The Teaching of the New Testament.** When we turn to the New Testament we find

(I) Our Lord affirms

(*a*) That *none is good, save One, even God*[1] (Mark x. 18, R.V.);

(*b*) That *from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed, fornications, thefts, murders, adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, pride, foolishness*[2] (Mark vii. 21, 22);

[1] Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός. According to S. Matthew xix. 17 our Lord leads the young man up to God, the Source of all good, from the question, "What good thing shall I do?" but according to S. Mark and S. Luke from the appeal, "Good Master." Both agree very well together. "Good Master, what good thing must I do?" runs the question; the answer is "How divided and isolated seems to thee what is *good!*" Jesus does not decline the appellation "good"; He repels it only in the superficial sense of the questioner. The young man deals with good in its relative meaning; and in this sense he says "Good," that is "Excellent" Master. "Jesus teaches him to apprehend good in its absoluteness; and to that end he must understand the being good, which he ascribes to Christ, as being founded in God." Lange *in loc.* "Deus est bonus: bonitas non est sine Deitate.... Jesus titulum Bonitatis sine titulo Deitatis ab illo non accipit: vindicatque honorem Patris sui, cum quo unum est." Bengel, on Mark x. 18.

[2] Thirteen forms of evil are here noticed as proceeding from the heart. The first seven in the plural number, are *predominant actions*; the latter six in the singular, *dispositions*. Comp. the blending of the singular and plural in S. Paul's enumeration of the works of the flesh, Gal. v. 19—21. "Our unassisted nature is represented in Scripture as the source of much that is evil, but not of anything that is good. We read much in Scripture of

(II) S. Paul states distinctly that

(*a*) *In Adam all die* (1 Cor. xv. 22);

(*b*) *Through one man sin*[1] *entered into the world, and death*[2] *through sin; and so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned* (Rom. v. 12);

(*c*) And as if specially to guard against the doctrine afterwards propounded by Pelagius, he adds, *Death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression*[3] (Rom. v. 14).

Thus the teaching of Scripture clearly supports the statement of the Article that the sinful determination of the will on the part of our first parents necessarily involved a disturbance of the whole mode of human existence. Its teaching is not that the guilt of Adam's sin is *imputed* to his progeny, so that they deserved punishment for it though innocent of it themselves[4]. The teaching of Scripture, as regards the doctrine of original sin, is in strict harmony with the modern scientific theory or doctrine of heredity. It is a matter of everyday experience that the sinful habits of parents are transmitted by them to their children, as certainly as other qualities and tendencies are passed on by inheritance. Human nature is bound up together, so that

evil coming out of the natural heart, but nothing of good coming out of it." Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, v. p. 132.

[1] Ἡ ἁμαρτία...ὁ θάνατος. "The article expresses, *sin universal...death universal*." Vaughan on Rom. v. 12.

[2] "*Natural* death, primarily, and as the punishment specially denounced; *spiritual and eternal* death incidentally and secondarily, as the necessary consequence of the severance of a creature from the service and love of the Creator." Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] Καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ (Rom. v. 14), "*even upon those who sinned not upon* (*on the model of*) *the likeness of the transgression of Adam.* That death, which marked the presence of sin, was inflicted even where there had been no *following of Adam*." Vaughan *in loc.*

[4] "Inobedientia et peccatum Adæ realiter inhæret nobis, non autem tantum imputatur nobis." Corn. à Lap. in Rom. v. 12.

what one man does diffuses itself as widely as possible[1]. When the first man sinned, his transgression was diffused like the ripples on the water, and each sin diffuses itself in the same way as the first sin, and adds to the sum[2].

xii. **The Teaching of the Early Fathers** distinctly recognises the solidarity of the human race. Though the term Original Sin did not come prominently into use before the time of Pelagius and S. Augustine, we find the early Fathers speaking of the inherent taint in man's nature under such expressions as "the Old Transgression," "the Ancient Wound," "the Old Death." Thus

(*a*) Ignatius writes, "Christ gave Himself for us that He might cleanse us from *the Old Transgression*[3]";

(*b*) Justin Martyr remarks that Christ was crucified "for mankind, who *through Adam had fallen under death* and the deception of the Serpent[4]."

(*c*) Irenæus writes that "men are no otherwise saved from *the Ancient Wound of the Serpent*, unless they believe in Him, who according to the likeness of sinful flesh is exalted from the earth on the

[1] "Fuit Adam et in illo fuimus omnes." S. Ambrose. "In lumbis Adam fuimus." "Unusquisque homo cum primo nascitur." "In illo qui hoc fecit, quando id egit, omnes eramus." S. Augustine. See Mozley's *Lectures*, p. 142. "A flaw in the metal of a steamship's machinery, for which no one seems responsible, will in a moment convert the sea from a high road into a grave; the sleep of a tired official, too long at his post, will condemn a hundred helpless travellers to tortures or death. The selfishness of a single statesman may plunge nations into war, and an epigram before now has lighted the fires of revolution. Everywhere the same stern law operates and infinitesimal transgressions produce infinite results." Illingworth's *Sermons*, p. 51.

[2] "The *ethical basis of nature*, which is not only in but *born with* the individual, is conditioned for each succeeding generation by the generations going before. Individuals and races are organic points in the sum total of development, which has its starting point in the first Adam, and they by nature repeat the Adamic type. Every individual begins from his birth an abnormal development of life whose universal characteristic is the conflict between the flesh and the spirit." Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 174, E. T.

[3] *Ep. ad Trall.* viii.

[4] *Dial. cum Tryph.* lxxxviii. 316, A.

Tree of Martyrdom, and draweth all things to Himself and quickeneth the dead[1]."

(*d*) Tertullian speaks of Satan as having "seduced men to violate the command of God, so that he therefore became subject to death, and his whole race, being infected by his sin, was rendered liable to condemnation[2]."

(*e*) Cyprian maintains that "the remission of sins by Baptism ought not to be denied to an infant, who being newly born has not sinned, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his earliest birth contracted *the contagion of the Old Death*[3]."

xiii. **The Taint remaineth even in the regenerate.** The Article next proceeds to state that this infection of nature remains even in those who are baptized and regenerate. For though the Sacrament of Baptism takes us out of our state by nature and places us in a "state of salvation"; though it unites us to Christ and thus cancels the guilt of original and actual sin, yet it does not eradicate the natural tendency to sin, or heal the wounds which man's nature has inherited from the first Adam[4].

[1] *Adv. Hær.* iv. 4, Ed. Cantabr. 1857; "non aliter salvari homines ab antiqua Serpentis plaga nisi credunt in Eum, qui secundum similitudinem carnis peccati in ligno martyrii exaltatur a terra, et omnia trahit ad Se, et vivificat mortuos."

[2] Tertull. *de Anima*, cap. 40.

[3] "Quanto magis [a baptismo] prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ primo nativitate contraxit." Cyprian, *Epist.* 64 *ad Fidum*.

[4] Οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Rom. viii. 1. Still, as S. Augustine remarks, "Regeneratus quippe non regenerat filios carnis, sed generat; ac per hoc in eos non quod regeneratus, sed quod generatus est, trajicit." *De Peccato Orig.* xl. Moreover, as he further says, "ipsa desideria vitiosa...in eodem lavacro Baptismatis universo purgantur," i.e., concupiscence is removed *reatu*, but remains *actu*, and thenceforth, so far as the will does not consent, the *motus concupiscentiæ* are not present *reatu* but only *actu*.

xiv. **Scripture Proof.** And this accords with the teaching of Scripture. For

(i) S. Paul could say of himself long after his Baptism,

(*a*) *I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage; lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected* (1 Cor. ix. 27);

(*b*) *I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing* (Rom. vii. 18);

(*c*) *The good which I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I practise* (Rom. vii. 19)[1].

(ii) Again he exhorts his converts to follow his example as regards self-discipline: Thus

(*a*) He bids the Galatians *walk by the Spirit, and*, he adds, *ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh* (Gal. v. 16);

(*b*) He exhorts the Colossians to *mortify their members which are upon the earth* (Col. iii. 5);

(iii) S. Peter, again, bids those who have long been grafted into the Church by Holy Baptism,

(*a*) To *abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul* (1 Pet. ii. 11);

(*b*) To *be sober and watchful*, and to resist the devil who as *a roaring lion* was ever *walking about, seeking whom he might devour* (1 Pet. v. 8);

(iv) And S. John, addressing well-established Churches in Asia Minor, says,

[1] Οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν· ἀλλ' ὃ οὐ θέλω κακόν, τοῦτο πράσσω. The distinction here, as marked in the R.V., between ποιῶ and πράσσω is very observable.

(*a*) *If we say that we have no sin*[1], *we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us* (1 John i. 8);

(*b*) *If any man sin*[1], *we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous*[2] (1 John ii. 1).

These passages are sufficient to show that though the guilt of sin is cancelled in Baptism, yet the tendency to it and the infection of it remain even in them who are "regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church."

xv. **Concupiscence.** The last clause of the Article asserts that "although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized," yet the Apostle Paul, who tells us this, "doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin." He himself writes, *I had not known sin, except through the Law; for I had not known lust, except the Law had said Thou shalt not lust* (Rom. vii. 7)[3]. Here lust and sin seem to be identified. Again he says, *Let not sin reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof* (Rom. vi. 12), and S. James affirms that *Lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin* (Jas. i. 15)[4].

[1] Ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, *We have no sin.* "The phrase ἁμαρτίαν ἔχειν is peculiar to S. John in the N. T. Like corresponding phrases ἔχειν πίστιν (Matt. xvii. 20; xxi. 21 &c.), ζωὴν ἔχειν (John v. 26, 40 &c.), λύπην ἔχειν (John xvi. 21 f.), &c., it marks the presence of something which is not isolated but a continuous source of influence. (Comp. κοινωνίαν ἔχειν *v.* 3.) Thus 'to have sin' is distinguished from 'to sin' as the sinful principle is distinguished from the sinful act in itself." Westcott *in loc.*

[2] "Christ as Advocate pleads the cause of the believer against his 'accuser' (κατήγορος, Apoc. xii. 10; comp. Zech. iii. 1; ἀντίδικος, 1 Pet. v. 8)." Westcott *in loc.* On παράκλητος, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 212.

[3] Τήν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ἤδειν, εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν, Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις = *Thou shalt not covet or lust*, see R.V. of Rom. vii. 7. "*My knowledge* (consciousness) *of desire*, as a restless unruly force within, *was due to its prohibition by the Law*...The imperfect (ἔλεγεν) seems to express the *reiteration* of the prohibition, in every hearing and reading of the Decalogue. *The Law was saying; kept saying.*" Vaughan *in loc.*

[4] Ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν, Jas. i. 15. For the metaphor compare Ps. vii. 15, LXX ὠδίνησεν ἀδικίαν, συνέλαβε πόνον καὶ ἔτεκεν ἀνομίαν. "Sin is the result of the surrender of the will to the soliciting of ἐπιθυμία instead of the guidance of reason. In itself ἐπιθυμία may be

The Mediæval Divines regarded the existence of lust or concupiscence as one of the disorders of man's natural powers, one of the wounds inflicted on his nature at the Fall, as tending to sin, but not in itself actual sin[1]. The Reforming Divines of the Sixteenth Century regarded man's carnal concupiscence[2] as sinful, seeing it may tempt to deadly wickedness, unless by God's grace it is strenuously resisted[3]. The statement of the Article holds an intermediate place between these views. It recognises the dangerous *tendency* of concupiscence, but it also holds with S. James that, only *when it hath conceived*, can it be regarded as *actual* sin. The evil bias obviously has *the nature of sin*[4], but it is not *actually* sin until yielded to by a voluntary submission of the will.

natural and innocent; it is when the man resolves to gratify it against what he feels to be the higher law of duty, that he becomes guilty of sin even before he carries out his resolve in act." Mayor *in loc.*

[1] The "Pronitas ad Malum." See Winer's *Confessions of Christendom*, p. 99.

[2] The Catechism of the Council of Trent, iii. 10, defines concupiscentiam as "commotionem quamdam ac vim animi qua impulsi homines quas non habent res jucundas appetunt."

[3] The *Assembly of Divines* define concupiscence as "truely and properly sin," and similarly the Saxon Confession. Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 376, ed. 1859.

[4] It contains in it a "rationem peccati," but not "veram et propriam rationem." Without being actual sin, it *inclines* to sin. Bishop Gardiner writes, "Althoughe the gylte of originall synne be taken away in baptysme, yet the *scarre of it* (as it were), *ye matter of it doth remayne*, whiche as it troubleth and letteth man's perfection in virtue...so *it is not to be accompted our synne* tyll we conceyue it by embracyng and agreynge to such carnall motions." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 377, ed. 1859.

Article X.

1563.

De Libero Arbitrio.

Ea est hominis post lapsum Adæ conditio, ut sese naturalibus suis viribus et bonis operibus ad fidem et invocationem Dei conuertere ac præparare non possit: Quare absque gratia Dei, quæ per Christum est, nos præueniente, ut velimus, et cooperante dum volumus, ad pietatis opera facienda, quæ Deo grata sint et accepta, nihil valemus.

1571.

Of free wyll.

The condition of man after the fall of Adam is suche, that he can not turne and prepare hym selfe by his owne naturall strength and good workes, to fayth and calling vpon God: Wherefore we haue no power to do good workes pleasaunt and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christe preuentyng us, that we may haue a good wyll, and workyng with vs, when we haue that good wyll.

i. **Connection.** The Tenth Article continues the subject treated of in the previous one, and deals with the results of the Fall as they affect the human will, and necessitate the help of Divine Grace.

ii. **The Title** of the Article, "Of Freewill," hardly corresponds with the contents, for it does not directly assert the freewill of man at all, or define its powers, but deals with it rather by implication. It might be more truly entitled, "Of the Necessity of Divine Grace[1]," and it is drawn up almost exactly in the words of S. Augustine's Treatise, "Concerning Grace and Freewill."

iii. **History and Language.** As it now stands, the Article is considerably longer than in the original draft of 1553. Then it began with what is now the Second Clause,

[1] Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 152.

"We have no power to do good works," and lacked entirely the first Clause. This was added in 1563, and was derived in great measure from the "Confession of Würtemberg[1]," which was presented by the ambassadors of that State to the Council of Trent in 1552.

iv. **Object.** The Article is mainly directed against the doctrine of the Anabaptists, who revived in the Sixteenth Century the teaching of the older Pelagians, that the human will was possessed of such force and power, that without any special grace of Christ man could live a life acceptable unto God[2].

v. **Analysis.** The Article consists of three parts:

(i) It asserts as one of the results of the Fall that man's will has been so crippled that he cannot turn or prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith and calling upon God;

(ii) It states that the Grace of God is absolutely necessary to enable him to do this;

(iii) It explains that this Grace acts in two ways; (*a*) It is a Preventing Grace (*Gratia præveniens*) going before us and giving us a good will; (*b*) It is a Cooperating Grace (*Gratia cooperans*) working in us and with us when we have that good will.

vi. **Man's Freewill.** The whole of man's responsibility

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 127.

[2] Comp. *Reform. Legum*, c. vii., "Similiter nobis contra illos progrediendum est, qui tantum in libero arbitrio roboris et nervorum ponunt, ut eo solo sine ulla speciali Christi gratia recte ab hominibus vivi posse constituant." "Pelagianism, in its reckoning up of human possibilities, omitted a class of very discouraging facts,—the inclination to self-will, which, explain it as we may, is observable 'from the moment of dawning reason,' and the limitations which do not destroy the reality of freewill, but clog its action, and hem it in with the meshes of habit." Dr Bright's *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 192.

rests upon the freedom of his will. "If there is no freedom, there can be no virtue nor vice, no merit or fault, no moral government of the universe[1]." How indeed God knows all things and orders all things, and yet leaves man's will free is a question which has occupied the ablest intellects[2]. The solution of the problem must for the present be left under the shadow of God's throne for a higher state of intelligence. This, at any rate, is certain, that as the sin of Adam was an *abuse* of freewill, so ever since then the human will has been sorely weakened and crippled, and retains no longer that proper controlling power which it ought to possess. It is not sufficient, alone and unaided, to enable man to save himself, to resist temptation, or to make any effective exertion towards active holiness. For this purpose he needs the assistance of a Higher Power, and the Gospel justifies its name by announcing that God is able and willing to repair the mischief which has crippled man's will, and to impart the strength he requires[3].

vii. **Grace.** The word which expresses this provision for human needs is *Grace.* It comes from the Latin *Gratia,* and is the equivalent of the Greek Χάρις. In its first and most simple meaning this word denotes (1) *a favour;* then (2) the *unmerited favour of God towards*

[1] Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 153.

[2] "The question of the relations between the liberty of man and the Divine power, of the influence of God upon the moral activity of men, is not peculiar either to the fifth century or to Christianity, but is a universal problem, which all religions, all systems of philosophy, have propounded to themselves, and have endeavoured to solve." Guizot's *History of Civilisation in France.*

[3] "Man's will is not only sprained and weakened, not only so much enfeebled that it cannot set itself persistently to recover its strength, but more it is in various degrees positively bent in a direction from God. *The mind of the flesh is enmity against God* (Rom. viii. 7), it does not submit to God's Law. The help man needs must come from without and from above. God alone can undo that which by his Fall man has inflicted on creation and on himself. The great Message of the Gospel is that God is not only able so to do, but willing also; and that He has, in fact, done it in the Person of His Son Incarnate." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 121.

humanity at large as displayed in the Incarnation of His Son; then (3) the *operation* of the same unmerited favour in its application to *individual souls*. In reference to the present subject it may be defined to be the strengthening power[1] freely bestowed upon us by God the Father for the sake of Jesus Christ His Son and wrought in us by the Holy Ghost, to enable us to know and do the will of God[2].

viii. **Prevenient Grace.** The Grace of God, then, corrects the natural bias of the will in fallen man towards evil. It attracts, persuades, and aids the will to a right choice. The very first movement of the will towards what is good comes from God, and is known in theological language as *Prevenient* or *Antecedent* Grace. Thus it is a supernatural motion of the soul to will what is good and to refuse what is evil. Hence our Lord says, *No man can come to Me, except the Father which sent Me draw*[3] *him* (John vi. 44), and again, *Apart from Me ye can do nothing* (John xv. 5). Hence also S. Paul writing to the Ephesians says, *By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God* (Eph. ii. 8); and to

[1] "The Gratia gratum faciens is that inward help, freely bestowed, which God for the merits of Christ grants to fallen man, both to help his infirmity in the way of abstaining from that which is evil and doing that which is good." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 157. "Grace is not simply kindly feeling on the part of God, but a positive boon conferred on man. Grace is real and active force; it is, as the Apostle says, 'the power that worketh in us' (Eph. iii. 20), illuminating the intellect, warming the heart, strengthening the will of redeemed humanity." Liddon's *University Sermons*, First Series, p. 44.

[2] "Grace is power. That power whereby God works in nature is called force. That power whereby He works on the wills of His reasonable creatures is called Grace." Mozley *On Predestination*, p. 302. The potency of Grace as contrasted with the impotence of Law is a marked conception of S. Paul's. With him Grace is an invigorating and protecting force. Cf. Rom. vi. 14; viii. 3. Grace is "the vital force of the Body of Christ." Liddon on Rom. xii. 6.

[3] Ἑλκύσῃ. Ἑλκύειν differs from σύρειν. Σύρειν implies *force*, and = *to drag* (see Acts viii. 3; xiv. 19; xvii. 6). Ἑλκύειν implies an attraction of some kind, and inducement to come. Comp. Jer. xxxviii. 3, LXX. "With lovingkindness have I *drawn* thee," εἵλκυσά σε; John xii. 32, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will *draw* all men unto Myself," ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν.

the Philippians he writes, *It is God which worketh in you both to will and to work, for His good pleasure* (Phil. ii. 13). Thus the Grace of God prevents, or goes before, us, that we may have a good will.

ix. **Cooperating Grace.** But the Grace of God is needed not only that we may desire what is right, but also that we may do it when we desire it. Hence we need *Cooperating* or *Assisting* Grace, whereby God "cooperates with us to will and to do that to which He had previously stirred us up." So our Lord, who says, *Apart from Me*[1] *ye can do nothing*, also says, *As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself*[2], *except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye, except ye abide in Me* (John xv. 4, 5). Having united our humanity in an indissoluble union with His own Divine Nature, He has become to it *a life-giving spirit* (1 Cor. xv. 45). He is the Fount and Source of that holy inspiration, whereby man not only thinks those things that are good, but is mercifully enabled to perform the same[3]. His Grace, however, never constrains or forces the will; it never supersedes man's self-determination[4]. On our part there is much to do. Hence the same Apostle, who tells the Philippians, *It is God which worketh in*[5] *you both to will and to work*, bids them on their part *work out their own salva-*

[1] Χωρὶς ἐμοῦ = *apart from Me;* not simply "without My help," but "separated from Me." Comp. χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, Eph. ii. 12, and S. John i. 3, χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.

[2] Ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ = not simply "in itself," but "from itself," as the source of its own vital energy. Comp. S. John v. 19, vii. 18, xi. 51, xvi. 13. Westcott *in loc.*

[3] See the Collect for the First Sunday after the Epiphany.

[4] "Liberum arbitrium non evacuatur per gratiam, sed statuitur, quia gratia sanat voluntatem, qua justitia libere diligatur." S. Aug. *de Spir. et Litt.* xxx. (52).

[5] God's grace works *with* us, not merely *in* us. In 1552 and 1563 it had been "in" and not "with." The change was made in 1571, and is in harmony with Article ix. Hence it is well laid down in the *Necessary Doctrine*, "All men be also to be monished, and chiefly preachers, that in this high matter, they, looking on both sides, so attemper and moderate themselves that they neither so preach the grace of God that they take away thereby free will, nor on the other side so extol free will, that injury be done to the grace of God."

tion with fear and trembling[1] (Phil. ii. 12), and he exhorts the Corinthians to beware that they *receive not the grace of God in vain* (2 Cor. vi. 1).

x. **The Early Fathers** teach the same doctrine. Thus

(*a*) Irenæus writes, "No man, who does not partake of the blessing and assistance of the Lord, can procure for himself the means of salvation[2]";

(*b*) Tertullian writes, "In order to imitate the pattern, which Christ has left us, we have need of the Grace of God[3]";

(*c*) Clement of Alexandria writes, "While a man strives and labours of himself to subdue his vicious affections, he can do nothing; but if he manifests an earnest and vehement desire to do so, he is enabled by the Divine Power to accomplish his purpose; for God favours and cooperates with the willing mind[4]";

(*d*) Once more, S. Augustine says, "If without God we can do nothing, certainly we can neither begin His work nor bring it to an end. For of the beginning it is said, 'His mercy shall go before me'; and of the end it is said, 'His mercy shall follow me all the days of my life'[5]."

[1] Μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε. The verb denotes *work out with perseverance to the end.* "When the Apostle commands us to work out our own salvation, he acknowledges our *free will;* but when he adds *with fear and trembling*, he warns us against the pride of ascribing our good works to *ourselves*, and therefore adds that it *is God which worketh in us.*" Bp C. Wordsworth on Phil. ii. 12.

[2] Iren. *Adv. Hæres.* iv. 27.

[3] Tertull. *de Orat.* c. iv.

[4] Clem. Alex. *Quis div. salv.*, c. 21.

[5] "Si enim sine illo nihil possumus facere, profecto nec incipere, nec perficere; quia ut incipiamus dictum est, *misericordia ejus præveniet me* (Ps. lviii. 11); ut perficiamus, dictum est, *misericordia ejus subsequetur me* (Ps. xxii. 6)." S. Aug. *contra duas Epist. Pelag.* Lib. ii. 21.

xi. **The Teaching of the Prayer Book.** With the teaching of the Fathers we may compare that of the Prayer Book. Twice a day, at Matins and Evensong, we pray, "O God *make clean* our hearts within us," and "*Take not* Thy holy Spirit from us." Again in the familiar Collect at the close of the Communion Service we pray, "*Prevent* us, O Lord, in all our doings, with Thy most gracious favour, and further us with Thy *continual* help." So also in the Collect for Easter Day we ask of God that, "as by His special grace *preventing* us He puts into our minds good desires, so by His *continual* help we may bring the same to good effect." Again in the Collect for the Ninth Sunday after Trinity we pray, "Grant to us, Lord, we beseech Thee, the spirit to think and do always such things as be rightful; that we, *who cannot do anything that is good without Thee*[1], may by Thee be enabled to live according to Thy will." Lastly in the Collect for the Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity we say, "Lord, we pray Thee, that Thy grace may always *prevent* and *follow* us, and make us *continually to be given* to all good works[2]."

xii. **Conclusion.** These passages from the Prayer Book conspire with the teaching of Scripture and the Primitive Fathers, and bear witness to the need on man's part of Prevenient Grace that he may have a good will, and of Cooperating Grace when he has that good will. For the will is not blinded but enlightened by Grace, and the whole man is enabled to act with *the liberty of the glory of the children of God* (Rom. viii. 21). Grace does not enslave the will, but enfranchises it[3].

[1] "Omne bonum opus hominis procedit a prima gratia sicut a principio: non autem procedit a quocunque humano dono." S. Thom. Aq., *Summa* ii. Q. CXIV. Art. 5.

[2] "The Prayer Book in this, as in all other respects, is consistently Anti-Pelagian." Bright's *Waymarks in Church History*, p. 203, *n.*

[3] "Not Grace alone," says S. Augustine, "nor man alone, but Grace working with man, will save;" and again, "He who created thee without thee, will not save thee without thee."

Article XI.

1563.	1571.
De Hominis Iustificatione.	*Of the iustification of man.*
Tantùm propter meritum Domini ac Seruatoris nostri Iesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra, iusti coram Deo reputamur: Quare sola fide nos iustificari, doctrina est saluberrima, ac consolationis plenissima: ut in Homilia de Iustificatione hominis fusiùs explicatur.	We are accompted righteous before God, only for the merite of our Lord and sauiour Jesus Christe, by faith, and not for our owne workes or deseruynges. Wherefore, that we are iustified by fayth onely, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homilie of iustification.

i. **Connection.** The Eleventh Article relates to a question, which the preceding one naturally suggests[1]. If the human will, in consequence of the fault and corruption of man's nature, is so crippled that he cannot of his own strength do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, how is he accounted righteous in His sight, and on what grounds is he regarded by God with any degree of favour?

ii. **Source and History.** This question the present Article answers, and it is itself derived from the Fourth Article of the Augsburg Confession of 1530[2]. As it stood in the original draft, it consisted of a single clause, and asserted that "Justification by onely faith in Jesus Christ" is "a most certaine and holesome doctrine for Christian

[1] After the Tenth Article the Forty-Two of 1553 inserted one entitled "Of Grace," which was omitted in 1563.

[2] With this Article of the Augsburg Confession should be compared the language of the Fourth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538. Both affirm that men are accepted by God "gratis propter Christum per fidem."

menne"[1]. A new clause, now the first, was added in 1563, and was adopted from the corresponding Article of the Würtemberg Confession.

iii. **The Object** of the Article is to confute the ideas of human merit, which had long been propagated, more or less distinctly, in the whole of Western Christendom during the Middle Ages. But it has been remarked that it may also have in view the kindred tenets of the Anabaptists, who boasted themselves "to be righteous and to please God, not purely and absolutely for Christ's sake, but for their own mortification of themselves, for their own good works and persecution, if they suffer any[2]."

iv. **Analysis.** In its present shape the Article states (1) *Positively*, and (2) *Negatively* the grounds of our Justification before God.

(1) We *are* justified only for the merits[3] of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ;

(2) We are *not* justified before God for our own works or deservings;

(3) And this "is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

v. **Justification.** The word "Justification" comes from the Latin, in which language we have the verb "Justifico," which means, when used of a judge, *to absolve*

[1] "In that sense," it continues, "as is declared in the Homilie of Justification." There is no Homily entitled "the Homily of Justification." But "the Homily of Salvation" treats expressly of Justification, and it has, therefore, always been understood, either that this Homily alone, or this conjoined with that which precedes, and that which follows it, is the Homily referred to in the Article. See Bp Browne, p. 291.

[2] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 99, *n.*

[3] The Latin here is very noticeable. It is not said that we are accounted righteous "*propter* fidem," but "propter meritum...Christi *per* fidem." So in the Greek of the New Testament we are said to be justified πίστει Rom. iii. 28, ἐκ πίστεως Rom. v. 1, Gal. ii. 16; iii. 8, 24, διὰ πίστεως Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16; Ephes. iii. 12, but never διὰ πίστιν.

or *acquit*[1], of God, as a sovereign, *to pardon, forgive*[2]. The substantive "justificatio," which properly denotes *a justifying, pardoning*[3], when applied to beings tainted, as we are, with sin, includes (1) forgiveness of sin[4], (2) reconciliation to God, (3) the renovation of the inner man.

vi. **The Moving Cause of our Justification.** Now it is obvious that the *original* or *moving* cause of our Justification cannot be anything in ourselves. Man cannot forgive sins, or reconcile himself to God, or renew his moral nature. Sin taints his best and purest actions, and in the sight of a God of perfect holiness *by the works of law shall no flesh be justified* (Rom. iii. 20)[5]. Justification must be due simply and solely to the free and undeserved Grace and goodness of God. *It is God that justifieth* (Rom. viii. 33)[6].

[1] Comp. Vulg. Prov. xvii. 15, "qui justificat impium, et qui condemnat justum, abominabilis est uterque apud Deum," and Isai. v. 23, "qui justificatis impium pro muneribus."

[2] "Hæc est magnificentia Domini, justificatio peccatoris." S. Ambros. *Enarr. in Psalm.* cx. 3.

[3] Similarly in Greek Δικαίωσις denotes *the establishment of man as just by acquittal from guilt.* Thus in Rom. iv. 25 we read ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν, and the verb δικαιοῦν, which literally means *to make righteous*, is used both in the LXX. and the N.T. with the meaning *to acquit, absolve*, or *clear from guilt;* comp. Gen. xliv. 16; Exd. xxiii. 7; Ps. cxliii. 2; Acts xiii. 39. It is important to note that Justification by Faith is not the Scripture phrase, but Justification by Faith *in Jesus Christ*, i.e. Justification by Faith *and Grace.*

[4] "Remissio peccatorum est justificatio," S. Thom. Aquin. *Quæst. Disput.* xxviii. Art. i.: "Justificatio significat remissionem peccatorum, et reconciliationem seu acceptionem ad vitam æternam," Melancthon *De Grat. et Justif. Loci Theologici;* "Justification signifieth remission of our sins, and our acceptance or reconciliation into the grace and favour of God," Articles of 1536. See also the Homily of the *Salvation of Mankind.*

[5] "By whose merits shall I be delivered? Not by my own, O Lord; but in Thy righteousness deliver me. In Thy righteousness, I say, not mine. For I implore mercy; I do not offer my own righteousness...Thy grace is Thy righteousness, O Lord. And grace could not be grace if it were given for deserts; therefore, not in my own righteousness, but in Thy righteousness deliver me from my sins." Savonarola, *Sorrow and Hope, A Meditation on the 31st Psalm*, 1498.

[6] Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν. Comp. Isai. l. 7—9, ἔγνων ὅτι οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ· ὅτι ἐγγίζει ὁ δικαιώσας με. This passage is evidently in the mind of the Apostle. "And seeing all that we of ourselves can do, is not only nothing, but naught; let Him alone have the glory, by whose only grace we have our whole ability and power

vii. **The Meritorious Cause of our Justification.** But while the love of God is the moving cause, the *meritorious* cause of our justification is the finished work of Christ. It is His merits, and His merits only, which have purchased for us this great boon. Living for us a life of perfect obedience, and dying for us on the Altar of His Cross, He has procured for us the forgiveness of our sins. Thus S. Paul writing to the Romans says that we are *justified freely*[1] *by the grace of God through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus* (Rom. iii. 24)[2]; and S. Peter writes *Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God*[3] (1 Pet. iii. 18); and S. John writes *Herein is love*[4], *not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins* (1 John iv. 10).

viii. **The Efficient Cause.** Though, however, the love and mercy of God are infinite, and the merits of Christ are sufficient, yet all men do not benefit by this Grace. Something, therefore, internal is needed to connect them with the external work of our salvation, and this is the action of the Holy Spirit[5] (Rom. viii. 14). It is His potent operation,

of well-doing." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. App. i. 14.

[1] Δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν = we are justified *as* (*by way of*) *a gift, gratuitously*. Compare the LXX. of Gen. xxix. 15; 1 Chron. xxi. 24, and see Matt. x. 8, δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε.

[2] Comp. also Rom. iii. 21, 22, χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται...δικαιοσύνη δὲ Θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ = *A righteousness of God*, communicated in each individual instance *by means of faith of* (in) *Jesus Christ*. Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] "Non mors sed voluntas placuit sponte morientis, et illa morte expungentis mortem, operantis salutem." S. Bern. *De Error. Abael.* iii. 21; S. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo* i. 9. The source of merit is the perfect obedience of the Human Will of the Divine Person; any act of such an obedience is of infinite merit, yet, seeing that Redemption was wrought under the conditions of human history, the obedience finds its ultimate expression in the Cross and Passion. Comp. Phil. ii. 8; Heb. x. 5—10.

[4] "The source of love is the free-will of God Himself. He loved us, because 'He is love,' and in virtue of that love sent His Son. The origin of love lies beyond humanity." Westcott *in loc.*

[5] "The Holy Spirit realises and completes the redemption which Christ has wrought in essence and virtue. God the Son atoned; God

which leads to Christ, moves the heart, and endows us with the ability "to will and to work of God's good pleasure."

ix. **The Instrumental Cause.** The first instrument, by which God conveys Justification is, under ordinary circumstances, Baptism[1]. By this Sacrament He "doth work invisibly in us," and translates us from a state of nature into a state of adoption and Grace. We thus become members of Christ, and being united to Him, we receive the forgiveness of our sins, and become partakers of His righteousness. The second instrument is the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For by the devout reception of the Holy Eucharist the life of Justification begun in Baptism is nourished and supported, for feeding on Christ's Body and Blood "we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us[2]."

x. **Faith.** What, then, is the office of Faith in Justification? It is the hand which grasps and appropriates the righteousness wrought out for us by Christ[3]. By faith the

the Holy Ghost justifies." Newman, *On Justification*, pp. 204, 206.

[1] It was Christ who merited that the Sacraments should have the power of uniting us to Him. Of His great mercy He has freely appointed these remedies for us, who could in no wise obtain them of ourselves. See Hooker *Eccl. Pol.* v. chap. lvii. 2—4.

[2] Compare the words of the Church Catechism, "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine." "This then is one of the first elements of Christian knowledge and a Christian spirit, to refer all that is good in us, all that we have of spiritual life and righteousness to Christ our Saviour; to believe that He works in us, or to put the same thing more pointedly, to believe that saving truth, life, light, and holiness are not *of* us, though they must be *in* us." Newman's *Parochial and Parish Sermons*, v. p. 132.

[3] In accordance with the above statements we may thus tabulate the

Causæ Justificationis Nostræ:

i. *Causa Movens:* The free, unmerited, mercy of God.

ii. *Causa Meritoria:* (α) The Life of perfect obedience, and (β) The Passion of our Blessed Lord.

iii. *Causa Efficiens:* The Holy Spirit.

iv. *Causa Instrumentalis:* Grace in (α) Holy Baptism, which grafts us into Christ; (β) The Holy Eucharist, which maintains our union with Him.

Christian puts himself simply and loyally in God's hands, and appropriates to Himself the Redemption, which the Precious Blood of His dear Son has purchased for the world. And as the faith of Abraham *was reckoned to him for righteousness*[1] (Rom. iv. 3), so the faith of the humblest Christian is reckoned to him for that righteousness, which his purest and best actions could not offer to God, but which is made over to him by his Lord and Saviour[2].

xi. **The Life of Faith.** Faith, moreover, teaches us to employ diligently all the means provided by Him, in Whom we believe. Faith brought us in infancy to Baptism, and by Baptism we were engrafted into Christ's Church, and made partakers of His righteousness. Faith teaches us by prayer to plead the promise of the forgiveness of our sins then signed and sealed to us. Faith bids us claim the assistance of the Holy Spirit promised to every baptized Christian. Faith leads us to the reception of the Holy Eucharist, wherein we feed on Christ *the living Bread*[3]

v. *Causa Recipiens:* Faith { which (α) appropriates Christ's perfect obedience, and (β) works by love.

[1] Ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, Gen. xv. 6, LXX. = *His faith was reckoned unto him* (*put down in the account for, counted as*) *righteousness.* The passage is quoted also in Gal. iii. 6, and James ii. 23. In the Hebrew the active is used, *And He* (*God*) *counted it to him for righteousness.* It is remarkable that this record is appended not to any act of obedience, such as leaving his country or the offering up of Isaac, but to a process of faith in the mind and heart alone. Compare the context ἀρίθμησον τὰς ἀστέρας...οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου· καὶ ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. God, in His infinite love and hope for us, estimates us, not as we already are, but as we are on the way to become. "He sees faith at a point higher and deeper than any act; the simple taking Him at His word, and being *fully persuaded that what He has promised, He is able to perform.*" Vaughan on Rom. iv. 3.

[2] *Remission of sins* is Grace, "because it is God's own free gift; faith which qualifies our minds to receive it, is also grace, because it is an effect of His gracious Spirit in us; we are therefore justified by faith without works, by grace without merit." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. Append. i. 16.

[3] Ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν, not merely the Bread of life (John vi. 48), the life-giving Bread, but the living Bread, having life in itself, which life is imparted to those who partake of the Bread.

(John vi. 51). Again faith it is that prompts us to charity and all good works. Thus faith is the living bond of union betwixt Christ and the soul, and God looks upon us not as we are seen in ourselves[1], but as we are seen in Christ, who, by virtue of the completeness of the union effected by His Incarnation, brings it about that "all that is ours becomes His, and all that is His becomes ours—even that perfect righteousness, which swallowed up and expiated our sin[2]."

xii. **Patristic teaching.** The statements of the early Fathers respecting Justification are rather practical than formal. What they do say, however, is explicit enough. Thus:

(*a*) Clement of Rome writing to the Corinthians says, "We, having been called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby the Almighty God justified all men that have been from the beginning; to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen[3];"

(*b*) S. Polycarp writing to the Philippians says, "Let us, therefore, without ceasing hold fast by our hope and by the earnest of our righteousness, which is Jesus Christ who *took up our sins in His*

[1] See Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 391. "Faith is like the grain of mustard seed, a small insignificant, but fructifying seed-corn, which contains within it the fulness of a whole future. In His gracious contemplation God beholds in the seed-corn the future fruit of blessedness; in the pure will, the realized idea of freedom." Ibid. p. 392. "Tales nos amat Deus quales futuri sumus Ipsius dono, non quales sumus nostro merito." Prosper, *Sentent. S. Aug.* i. 56. See a striking illustration of this in one of F. W. Robertson's *Sermons*, series iii. p. 110.

[2] Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 208. Ed. 2.

[3] S. Clement, 1 *ad Cor.* xxxii.

own body upon the tree, Who did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth (1 Pet. ii. 22, 24), but for our sakes He endured all things, that we might live in Him[1];"

(*c*) S. Barnabas writes, "To this end the Lord endured to deliver His flesh unto corruption, that by the remission of sins we might be cleansed, which cleansing is through the Blood of His sprinkling[2];"

(*d*) Irenæus says, "All men fall short of the glory of God, and are justified not by themselves, but by the coming of the Lord[3];"

(*e*) S. Ambrose says, "I will not glory, because I am righteous, but because I am redeemed. I will glory, not because I am free from sins, but because my sins are forgiven me; not because I have profited, nor because any one hath profited me, but because Christ is my Advocate with the Father, and because Christ's Blood hath been shed for me[4]."

Passages to this effect might be multiplied, and though not couched in formal terms, yet they clearly bear out the language of the Article.

xiii. **In Conclusion** the doctrine of Justification by Faith only[5] is declared in the Article to be "a most wholesome Doctrine and very full of comfort." It is a "most

[1] S. Polycarp, *ad Philipp.* viii.
[2] S. Barnab. *Epist.* cap. v.
[3] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iv. xlii. 3.
[4] S. Ambros. *De Jacobo et Vita Beat.* i. 6, quoted by Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 277.
[5] Ex sola fide. The word *sola* here (alone) is not to be taken for "solitary," i.e. for a dead faith or a faith destitute of good works, or, at least, of the purpose of doing well. "This sentence, that we be justified by faith only, is not so meant, that the said justifying faith is alone in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and the fear of God, at any time and season." *Homily of Salvation.*

wholesome" doctrine, because it reminds us of our true condition, as we are in ourselves apart from the Grace of God, and thus it checks spiritual pride, and corrects any tendency to self-righteousness. It is "very full of comfort," because it assures those, who are conscious how imperfect are their best efforts after holiness, that He, Who "despises not the sighing of a contrite heart," will for Christ's sake and His all-sufficient merits accept their imperfect endeavours and unite them to Christ's all-perfect obedience. The doctrine of Justification by Faith recognises man's absolute need of Divine Grace in every stage of His progress in the Christian life. It renders high praise to God the Father, from Whom cometh every perfect gift, as the moving cause of our reconciliation and forgiveness; it glorifies the Son as the sole meritorious cause[1]; it honours the Holy Ghost, as the sole efficient cause, through whose potent operation alone we are enabled "to will and to work of God's good pleasure[2]."

[1] See Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 186.

[2] The reason why faith has a certain stress laid upon it over and above the other parts of a religious character in our justification is "because the Gospel being preeminently a covenant of grace, faith is so far of more excellence than other virtues, because it confesses this beyond all others. Works of obedience witness to God's just claims upon us, not to His mercy: but faith comes empty-handed, hides even its own worth, and does but point at that precious scheme of redemption which God's love has devised for sinners. Hence it is the frame of mind especially suitable to us, and is said in a special way to justify us, because it glorifies God, witnessing that He accepts those and those only, who confess they are not worthy to be accepted." Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, Vol. iii. p. 87. "The doctrine of justification by faith is implied in the old custom of the Roman Church, clearly symbolical, of holding a crucifix before the dying. For what else could this custom mean, except that the man now in the solemn hour of death must rely, not upon his own merits, not upon the merits of the saints, but solely upon the Crucified Christ, as the only Mediator? The crucifix it was that Pius VII. pressed to his breast in his dying moments, while with strong words he refused the name 'most holy Father,' which some one addressed to him. 'What,' he exclaimed, '*most holy Father!* I am a poor sinner.'" Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, E. T. p. 394.

Article XII.

1563.

De bonis Operibus.

Bona opera quæ sunt fructus fidei et iustificatos sequuntur, quanquam peccata nostra expiari et diuini iudicij seueritatem ferre non possunt, Deo tamen grata sunt et accepta in Christo, atque ex uera et uiua fide necessario profluunt, ut plane ex illis, æque fides uiua cognosci possit, atque arbor ex fructu indicari.

1571.

Of good workes.

Albeit that good workes, which are the fruites of fayth, and folowe after iustification, can not put away our sinnes, and endure the seueritie of Gods iudgement: yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christe, and do spring out necessarily of a true and liuely fayth, in so muche that by them, a lyuely fayth may be as euidently knowen, as a tree discerned by the fruit.

i. **Connection.** But if we are justified by faith only, the question arises, Does not this do away with, or at least disparage, the necessity of good works? It was to answer this objection and to clear up the language of the last Article, that the present one was introduced in 1563.

ii. **History and Object.** The present Article, then, was entirely lacking in the original draft of 1553, and was drawn up by Archbishop Parker to a certain extent from the Würtemberg Confession[1], to meet any charge that might be made against the Articles that they favoured the opinions of the Antinomians. These sectaries, in conjunction with the Solifidians, caused great trouble in the reign of Elizabeth, as is testified by Parker's own language[2], and

[1] See Hardwick, pp. 125 sqq.

[2] "They say that the realm is full of Anabaptists, Arians, Libertines, Free-will men, &c., against whom only I thought ministers should have needed to fight in unity of doctrine." Letter of Parker, March 1, 1558—9.

they had probably learnt their peculiar tenets abroad[1]. They taught that faith and faith only, quite independently of good works, was sufficient for salvation.

iii. **Analysis.** In opposition to these doctrines the Article asserts three points:

(1) That good works are "the fruits of Faith;"

(2) That they "follow after Justification," or more literally, "them that are justified[2];"

(3) That though they "cannot put away our sins and endure the severity of God's Judgement[3]; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring necessarily of a true and lively[4] Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

iv. **Good Works the fruits of Faith.** Our Lord repeatedly demanded of men that their moral conduct[5] shall be the test of true discipleship. Thus:

(*a*) In the Sermon on the Mount He requires of His followers not merely good works generally, but

[1] One of Luther's disciples, John Agricola, openly taught Antinomianism at Würtemberg, A.D. 1538, and though the doctrine was disclaimed by Luther, it tinged not a little the teaching of Munzer and John of Leyden.

[2] The Latin expression "justificatos sequuntur" occurs in S. Augustine, "Sequuntur enim bona opera justificatum, non præcedunt justificandum." *De Fide et Operibus*, xiv.

[3] This expression occurs in the Würtemberg Confession, "Omnia enim bona opera, quæ nos facimus, sunt imperfecta, nec possunt severitatem divini judicii ferre."

[4] The word "lively" in the English translation of the Article means "living," "full of life," "vigorous." Comp. Ps. xxxviii. 19, "mine enemies are *lively*"; Acts vii. 38, A.V., "who received the *lively* oracles to give unto us"; 1 Pet. i. 3, A.V., "a *lively* hope"; 1 Pet. ii. 5, A.V., "*lively* stones."

[5] "In His Miracles of mercy, faith was the condition our Lord exacted for the exertion of His powers of healing and restoration. On one occasion He says, '*All things are possible to Him that believeth*' (Mark ix. 23). Yet afterwards in His solemn account of the last judgment, He tells us it is obedience to His will which will then receive His blessing." Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, iii. p. 84.

the obedience of *the heart* as well as of the hands, and eye, and tongue (Matt. v. 15—48);

(*b*) Again He said to His Apostles, *Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; and so shall ye be My disciples* (John xv. 8);

(*c*) Moreover in His last solemn discourse on the Mount of Olives He makes *charity* and the exercise of *the corporal works of mercy*, the very condition of His approval at the judgment of the last day (Matt. xxv. 31—46).

Thus He makes it clear that faith being the beginning of the spiritual life, good works must of necessity spring out of it[1]. Faith is the root of good works, and where it is vital cannot but bring them forth[2].

v. **Good works follow after Justification.** This is taught again and again by S. Paul. While he insists strongly on faith as being the hand wherewith men embrace the righteousness wrought out for them by Christ, he insists equally strongly on the necessity of good works as the evidence of a man's continuance in a state of Justification. Thus he writes:

(*a*) To the Galatians, *Let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not* (Gal. vi. 9);

(*b*) And to the Ephesians, *We are God's workman-*

[1] "Faith is the root of good works, in that the root and the rest of the tree being of the same substance, these two are in fact one, different expressions of the same habit of soul: the living faith is the good work still silently shut up in the soul, and the good Christian work is nothing other than the faith brought to light." Bp Forbes, p. 188.

[2] "Faith does not cease with the first act, but continues. It works with obedience. In proportion as a man believes, so he obeys; they come together, and grow together, and last through life. Neither are perfect; both are on the same level of imperfection; they keep pace with each other; in proportion to the imperfection of one, so is the imperfection of the other; and as the one advances, so does the other also." Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, iii. p. 86.

ship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them (Eph. ii. 10)[1];

(*c*) And to Titus, *Jesus Christ gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession, zealous of good works* (Titus ii. 14).

And the other Apostles agree with His teaching. For

(*a*) S. James writes, *As the body apart from the spirit is dead, even so faith apart from works is dead* (Jas. ii. 26);

(*b*) S. Peter says to his converts, *So is the will of God, that by well doing ye put to silence the ignorance of foolish men* (1 Pet. ii. 15);

(*c*) And S. John affirms, *Hereby we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and do His commandments* (1 John v. 2).

We notice also that in the Eleventh Chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which professes to explain to us what faith is, the writer does so entirely by giving a list of the works which have sprung out of it, just as one, who wishes to describe the excellence of a fruit-tree, would dwell on the beauty and excellence, not of the roots and leaves, but of the fruit[2].

[1] Αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς. The expressions here are very strong. "The power of working does not spring out of ourselves, but from God, and therefore cannot have any intrinsic merit in it, for which we can claim salvation as a due...We are created anew in Christ Jesus, and were admitted into a state of salvation not *because we have done good works*, which merited salvation thereby; but we were admitted into that state by God's free grace, *in order that we might do good works*, which God before prepared for us as our appointed path to lead us to heaven." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.* "Debetur enim merces bonis operibus si fiant; sed gratia, quæ non debetur, præcedit ut fiant." S. Aug. *Op. Imp. contra Julianum*, i. 133. "Gratia datur ante ullum laborem, unde quisque mercedem accipiet secundum laborem." Prosper, *Sentent. S. Aug.*

[2] See Bp Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 322. Newman's *Parochial Sermons*, vol. i. pp. 170—172.

vi. **Good Works Imperfect.** But good works "cannot put away our sins[1], or endure the severity of God's Judgement." Many deeds, which pass for being just, good, and meritorious, would be seen to be quite the contrary, when brought to the standard of purity and sanctity which God requires, and might rightly exact from us. Moreover the works of the most perfect fall very far short of that goodness, wherewith we ought to worship, praise, and honour God, and though of His exceeding long-suffering He does not reckon against us these defects and imperfections, yet if He were *extreme to mark what is done amiss* (Ps. cxxx. 3), we could none of us stand in His sight. *If we say we have no sin*, writes S. John to those who had been long in a state of salvation, *we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us* (1 John i. 8).

vii. **We must take care,** however, not so to depreciate the value of man's part in the mighty cooperation due from him with the Grace of God as to represent great ventures of faith as less acceptable to God than they are. Our Lord Himself says *Herein is My Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit* (John xv. 8), and again He says, *There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for My sake and the Gospel's sake, but he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time...and in the world to come eternal life* (Mark x. 29, 30), and He warns all men that at the last day *He will render to every man according to his deeds* (Matt. xvi. 27). Hence S. Paul can assure (*a*) the Corinthians that *their labour is not in vain in the Lord* (1 Cor. xv. 58), (*b*) the Romans that the *sacrifice of their bodies is acceptable to God* (Rom.

[1] That is expiate (*expiare*) them. "Christ alone is the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, and we cannot set so much good work against so much past sin. We cannot keep a debtor and creditor account with God, and pay for the sins we love by certain acts, even the best." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 189.

xii. 1), (*c*) the Ephesians that we *are created in Christ Jesus for good works* (Eph. ii. 10), and S. James can declare that *pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world* (Jas. i. 27). We cannot elude the force of such passages as these. No man, indeed, can purchase heaven by his good works, for *eternal life is the free gift of God in Christ Jesus* (Rom. vi. 23)[1], but good works done in the power of Christ and with the aid of His Spirit are pleasing and acceptable unto God. Their merit, whatever it be[2], in its origin is not theirs, but the merit of Him, of Whom by Grace we are made living members[3]. Thus God crowns His own gifts in us, so that to Him, and to Him alone belongs, the glory, and the Apostle Paul can say, *I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me* (Gal. ii. 20).

viii. **The Teaching of S. Paul and that of S. James** have sometimes been supposed to be contrary the one to the other on the subject of faith and works. For

(*a*) S. Paul says, *We reckon that a man is justified by faith apart from works of law*[4] (Rom. iii. 28);

[1] "Sin gives *wages;* the ruin which follows it is fairly *earned;* but the Christian's reward is, after all, a *gift.*" Vaughan *in loc.*

[2] "Even the most active faith continues to confess, 'Meritum meum misericordia Domini,' and also 'Sufficit ad meritum scire, quod non sufficiant merita'." Oosterzee's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 654, quoting Bernard of Clairvaux. "Deus quum coronat merita nostra, quid aliud coronat quam Sua dona?" Prosper Aquit. 309 c. Thus merit, like righteousness, though not "of us," is yet very really "in us," and is, no less than other fruits of Grace, our own, given to us as a possession by Him, Who with His Son gives all that constitutes satisfying moral life.

[3] Merit, in the theological sense of the term, is the fruit of Grace; God gives *Sufficient Grace* (*Gratia sufficiens*), or, as it is sometimes called, First Grace. Upon the use made of Sufficient Grace depends (speaking humanly and without limiting the mercy of God) the gift of *Efficacious Grace* (*Gratia Efficax*); the moral government of God, where good use of sufficient grace is made, being the pledge of such a gift, οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης (Heb. vi. 10).

[4] Χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου, "*Apart from*

(*b*) While S. James writes, *Faith apart from works is barren* (Jas. ii. 20), and *By works a man is justified and not only by faith* (Jas. ii. 24).

But the expressions "faith" and "works," as employed by the two Apostles, have not precisely the same meaning. By "faith" S. Paul means a living active faith, and by "works" he means the ritual observances and external ceremonies of the Levitical Law[1]. S. James, on the other hand, means by "faith" a barren belief, a mere notional assent, and by "works" he means works of love and mercy. There is, therefore, no real contradiction between the two. S. Paul says we are justified by faith, that is a *living* faith, which must accordingly show itself by good works. S. James denies that we are justified by *mere* faith, that is a dead faith[2], which does not prove itself by works worthy of the Christian profession. Thus S. James regards the faith that justifies as *including* the works of faith. S. Paul regards the faith that justifies as *excluding* the works of the Jewish ceremonial Law.

(*as the ground of acceptance*) *any works of* (*belonging to, prescribed by*) *any law.*" Vaughan *in loc.*

[1] See Bp C. Wordsworth on Jas. ii. 24, and Godet on Rom. iii. 28.

[2] The expression "dead works" (Heb. vi. 1; ix. 14) is so often used in mistaken contempt of moral effort, that it is not superfluous to observe that it is, in the context where it occurs, applied to the works of the Levitical Law, which, as works belonging to a defunct system, are themselves defunct; to make more of the expression is to fall into the fallacy of arguing *a dicto secundum quid ad dictum simpliciter.* Comp. Westcott *in loc.*

Article XIII.

1563.

Opera ante Iustificationem.

Opera quæ fiunt ante gratiam Christi, et spiritus eius afflatum, cum ex fide Iesu Christi non prodeant, minimè Deo grata sunt: neque gratiam (ut multi uocant) de congruo merentur: Imo cum non sint facta ut Deus illa fieri uoluit et præcepit, peccati rationem habere non dubitamus.

1571.

Of workes before iustification.

Workes done before the grace of Christe, and the inspiration of his spirite, are not pleasaunt to God, forasmuche as they spring not of fayth in Jesu Christ, neither do they make men meete to receaue grace, or (as the schole aucthours saye) deserue grace of congruitie: yea rather for that they are not done as GOD hath wylled and commaunded them to bee done, we doubt not, but thei haue the nature of sinne.

i. **Connection.** The Thirteenth Article is another of the series respecting the precise value of good works, which it was deemed necessary to insert in consequence of the hot debates on the subject at the period of the Reformation.

ii. **The Title** has always remained the same since the first draft in 1553. But there is an apparent discrepancy between it and the first clause. While the Title speaks of "Works before Justification," the body of the Article speaks of "Works done before the grace of Christ and the Inspiration of His Spirit." In an early draft of the Articles of 1553 both the Title and first clause agree[1].

[1] See Hardwick, p. 401. "Opera quæ fiunt *ante justificationem*, cum ex fide Jesu Christi non prodeant, minime Deo grata sunt, neque gratiam, ut multi vocant, de congruo merentur." This was how the first clause ran in the Twelfth of the Forty-five Articles of 1552. See Hardwick *Hist. Art.* p. 281.

iii. **Object.** The design of the Article is to repudiate a theory of some of the Schoolmen[1], who affirmed that men may be entitled to receive Initial Grace, as the reward of actions which had been done by them in their own strength, and apart from the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. In other words the Article repudiates the doctrine of "congruous merit."

iv. **Congruous Merit** was an expression much used by the School Authors. Reviving the teaching of the Semi-Pelagians, some of them taught that it was possible for men before the Grace of Christ and the inspiration of His Spirit, to do works, which, though not actually good in themselves[2], yet had such a measure of goodness in them, that being in harmony[3] with the Divine Will, they attracted and merited Initial Grace.

v. **Analysis.** It is with this theory that the Article is concerned and it lays down two points:—

(*a*) That apart from the Grace of God there cannot be such a thing as good works;

(*b*) That if works are done apart from His Grace, they will be so tainted with human infirmity, that instead of meriting Initial Grace[4], they will

[1] Hence the "ut multi vocant" of the Latin version of 1552 is rendered in English "as the schole aucthours saye."

[2] The Dominicans differed on this point from the Franciscans, and the Council of Trent strongly affirmed, in opposition to a party of Pelagian Schoolmen, the inability of man to do good works without the Preventing Grace of God, "sine præveniente Spiritus Sancti inspiratione atque ejus adjutorio."

[3] Congruus, from *con* and *ruo*, denotes (i) *running* or *meeting together;* (ii) *agreeing with*, or *suitable to;* (iii) *harmonious*. For the verb congruere, compare Ter. *Phorm.* iv. 4. 14, "mulier mulieri magis congruit"; Cic. *Leg.* i. 20. 53, "de re una solum dissident, de cæteris mirifice congruunt"; for the adjective compare Plaut. *Mil.* iv. 3. 23, "sermo cum illa congruus." Hence Grace *de congruo* denoted Grace merited and conferred because of the congruity or harmony of the good work done with the revealed will of God.

[4] S. Thomas Aquinas in the course of his reply to the question, "Utrum homo possit sibi mereri primam gratiam," says:—

(1) "Iam etiam ipse actus fidei consequitur primam gratiam,

have the nature of sin, that blended with them there will ever be the taint of inherent imperfection.

vi. **Scripture teaching.** And this is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. For we learn from it that "the Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father," was *the Light of men* (John i. 4), not only during the brief period that He lived incarnate here on earth, but from the beginning, long before men knew Him in the flesh (John i. 9). Whatever virtue, therefore, there was in ancient times, or is amongst men, flowed not from any natural power of their own, but from Him, Who before He ever took upon Him our nature, was and is the One Source of Light and Life. He it is Who hath said and alone can say, *I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life* (John xiv. 6). Whatsoever good there was in a Job, a Ruth, a Naaman, in the repenting Ninevites[1], Nebuchadnezzar, the good centurion of the Gospels, or Cornelius, was not due to anything in themselves, or to any inherent goodness *of their own*, which could attract or merit Initial Grace[2]. The Grace was there already, and it prompted their several actions[3]. As the good fruit is not the cause that the tree is good, but the tree must first be good before it can bring forth good fruit, so a man cannot without help from God so do good works as to be pleasing

et ita non potest esse meritorius primæ gratiæ";

(2) "Deus non dat gratiam nisi dignis, non tamen ita quod prius digni fuerint, sed quia Ipse per gratiam eos facit dignos";

(3) "Omne bonum opus hominis procedit a prima gratia sicut a principio: non autem procedit a quocunque humano dono." *Summa*, II. Qu. cxiv. Art. 5.

[1] It is noteworthy that it is the Ninevites, a heathen people, to whom our Lord so forcibly alludes, when He would teach the duty of repentance (Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 30).

[2] "Cujus (Liberi Arbitrii) quippe conatus ad bonum, et cassi sunt, si a gratia non adjuvantur; et nulli, si non excitantur." S. Bernard, *De Gratia et Lib. Arb.* xiii. 42.

[3] See C. Kingsley's Sermon on the *Education of a Heathen.*

to Him. If he has done anything that is good, it has been because *the Light that lighteth every man* (John i. 9), even the Sun of righteousness, has already shone into his soul[1].

vii. **With whom does the Article not deal?** The Article, it is to be carefully observed, does not deal with the final state of the heathen world, or with those who have never heard the Name of Christ. As Revelation is addressed to those whom it concerns, and tells us very little of the state of those to whom it is not addressed, so on these subjects the Article preserves a complete silence[2]. We know that *God willeth that all men should be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth* (1 Tim. ii. 4). This is His revealed will. Our business is to follow in the path marked out for us, and not to ask *Lord, and what shall this man do?* (John xxi. 21), for in respect to the heathen world we may be sure that the *Judge of all the earth shall do right* (Gen. xviii. 25), and He, Who received the heathen Syro-phœnician woman and the Roman centurion[3], has Himself declared *that many shall come from the East and the West, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac,*

[1] "In all the higher and purer regions of thought you are nearer Christ, even though His Name be not uttered... 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest...think on these things,' for even if they do not bear His Name, they are assuredly in their essence His." Dr Liddon, Sermon reported in *Church of England Pulpit*, ix. p. 219. Ὅσα οὖν παρὰ πᾶσι καλῶς εἴρηται, ἡμῶν τῶν Χριστιανῶν ἐστί. Just. Mart. *Apol.* ii. § 13.

[2] "How God will deal with the heathen who have never heard His Name, is not for us to say. It opens up an immense question, on which there has been no decision by the Church. While charity hopeth all things, no lax view should affect our sense of the duty of missionary exertion, or diminish our value for those assertions, which attach the attainment of everlasting life to such conditions as faith, baptism, and holiness." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 206.

[3] "Albeit the works of heathen men are not to be compared with the good works of faithful men engraffed in the Church of Christ; yet for many causes, and principally for that without all controversy all good gifts and endowments, even in the paynims, are God's good gifts, they have the title and name of good works in some respects given unto them." Bp Woolton's *Christian Manual*, p. 43. Ed. Parker Soc.

and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness (Matt. viii. 11, 12).

viii. **With whom does the Article deal?** What the Article really denies is that form of semi-Pelagian teaching, revived by some of the Scholastic divines, which, refusing to accept the doctrine of the innate corruption of man's nature[1], asserted that he could of himself, apart from the Grace of God, do works *entitling* him to Initial Grace. What it asserts is that the spirit which would lead man to rely on his unassisted efforts, is not the spirit which is acceptable to God[2]. It is not the spirit of faith, nor that of grateful love in return for infinite benefits conferred[3]. It is a virtual denial of that human infirmity which clings to the best human actions, and makes them, in consequence of the inherent stain of sin, necessarily defective, and imparts to them "the nature of sin."

[1] "Ante gratiam in statu peccati homo habet impedimentum promerendi gratiam, scilicet ipsum peccatum." S. Thomas Aquin. *Summa*, Quæst. cxiv. Art. 5.

[2] Ultimately such a spirit is the spirit of unbelief; 'il faut encore dire que l'orgueil est le père de l'incrédulité...*Quomodo potestis credere*, dit Votre Seigneur, *Vos, qui gloriam ab invicem accipitis?*" Dupanloup, *L'Enfant*, pp. 241, 242.

[3] "Sed suspicentur homines quælibet merita bona, quæ putant præcedere, ut justificentur per Dei gratiam: non intelligentes, cum hoc dicunt, nihil aliud quam se negare gratiam." S. Prosper. Aquit. 333 *e*.

Article XIV.

1563.

Opera Supererogationis.

Opera quæ supererogationis appellant, non possunt sine arrogantia et impietate prædicari. Nam illis declarant homines non tantum se Deo reddere quæ tenentur, sed plus in eius gratiam facere quam deberent: cum apertè Christus dicat: Cum feceritis omnia quæcunque præcepta sunt uobis, dicite: Serui inutiles sumus.

1571.

Of workes of supererogation.

Voluntarie workes besydes, ouer and aboue Gods commaundementes, which they call workes of supererogation, can not be taught without arrogancie and impietie. For by them men do declare that they do not onely render vnto God as muche as they are bounde to do, but that they do more for his sake then of bounden duetie is required: Wheras Christe sayth playnly, When ye haue done al that are commaunded to you, say, We be vnprofitable seruantes.

i. **Connection.** The Fourteenth is another supplementary Article on the subject of good works. If, as we have seen, by our own works we cannot please God, and if those done, even after the reception of Grace, are acceptable only *in Christ*, while those done apart from the Grace of God have the nature of sin, is it possible for any to do more good works than of bounden duty is required of them, since every good work is simply an act of correspondence to Grace received?

ii. **Language.** This is what has sometimes been asserted, and it is with this doctrine respecting "works of supererogation" that the Article is concerned. The only point respecting its language, which requires notice, is that the English clause "voluntary works besides, over and

above, God's commandments, etc.," is fuller than the corresponding Latin, "opera quæ supererogationis appellant[1]."

iii. **Supererogation** is a Latin ecclesiastical word and came into English through the Vulgate, where it occurs as the translation of the injunction of the good Samaritan to the host at the inn respecting the man who fell amongst thieves, *Take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more* (*quodcunque supererogaveris*), *I, when I come again, will repay thee*[2]. In Classical Latin the word *Erogare* was specially applied to paying out money from the public treasury[3]. *Supererogare*, therefore, would denote to pay out more than is needed, and as an ecclesiastical expression it meant to pay out or give to God more than one was bound to do.

iv. **Origin of the doctrine.** The idea of works of supererogation gradually grew up in the Church, and was due to three chief causes:—

(α) The admiration of the early Church for martyrs and martyrdom;

(β) The belief in the superior merits of the celibate life;

(γ) The increasing respect paid in the Middle Ages to all kinds of ascetic practices.

Out of these causes arose the doctrine that there is a difference between the precepts of Christ, which are of universal obligation, and counsels of perfection, which were enjoined on those who could receive them. Such moral

[1] The word "impietate" was translated "iniquity" in the first draft of 1553, and was altered to "impiety" in 1563.

[2] Luke x. 35. Ὅ τι ἂν προσδαπανήσῃς, ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με ἀποδώσω σοι. "Curam illius habe, et *quodcunque supererogaveris*, ego cum rediero, reddam tibi."

[3] Comp. Cic. 2 *Verr.* iii. 71. 165, "Pecunia publica ex ærario erogata"; Livy i. 20, "Unde in eos sumptus pecunia erogaretur."

and religious duties, as were equally needful for all, belonged to the first class, while martyrdom, celibacy, virginity, and voluntary poverty belonged to the second[1]. These latter, being voluntary works, were called "works of supererogation," and the excess of merit thus attained by the saints formed part of the treasury at the disposal of the Church for the benefit of her members[2].

v. **Certain Passages of Scripture** are regarded as supporting the idea of works of supererogation.

(*a*) Such is the counsel given by our Lord to the rich young ruler[3], who approached Him with the question *Master, what shall I do that I may inherit eternal life?* To him our Lord replied *Keep the Commandments*, and referred him to those of the second Table. Then, when the young man answered that he had kept all these[4], and enquired *What lack I yet?* he received the reply, *One thing thou lackest*[5]*; go,*

[1] "Concilium perfectionis vocamus opus bonum, a Christo nobis non imperatum sed demonstratum, non mandatum sed commendatum." Bellarm. *De Monachis*, Bk ii. cap. vii.; S. Thomas Aquin. *Summa*, Pt. ii. 108, Art. iv.

[2] We have an illustration of this in the Libellatici of the early Church, who obtained tickets from martyrs and confessors qualifying them for restoration to the Church, inasmuch as the superior merits of these sufferers for the Faith made up for their own deficiencies. We have such a letter preserved in the correspondence of Cyprian, Epp. xxiii. Such a conception aided in the development of the use of Indulgences, which were granted out of the treasure of the Church, of which, while one part was her dower as "the bride of Christ," the other part was Works of Supererogation. Comp. Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy*, v. pp. 59 sqq. The development of the doctrine of a thesaurus meritorum or a thesaurus supererogationis perfectorum belongs to Alexander of Hales. *Summa*, Pars iv., Quæst. 23, Art. 2, membr. 5.

[3] Matt. xix. 16—30; Mark x. 17—31; Luke xviii. 18—30. He was young (Matt. xix. 22), of great wealth, and an ἄρχων (Luke xviii. 18), or ruler of a local synagogue, as was Jairus.

[4] We are told that when the Angel of death came to fetch the Rabbi Chanina, he said, "Go and fetch me the Book of the Law, and *see whether there be anything in it which I have not kept.*" Farrar's *Life of Christ*, ii. 161, *n.*

[5] "The work to be done is to love. Jesus quotes the second Table, as bearing on works of a more external and palpable kind, and consequently more like one of those which the

sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow Me (Mark x. 21[1]). Upon this it is observed that we have here not a general command but a counsel of perfection[2], and if the young man had adopted it, he would have done more than his duty, and performed a work of supererogation[3]. But it is plain that the answer was made to the young man's question *What lack I yet?* and our Lord told him what he lacked. Now if he lacked anything, it is plain that the supplying of that deficiency could not amount to a work of supererogation, but simply of duty and obligation, and it could not qualify him for a supereminent degree of glory[4].

(*b*) Again, arguments are drawn from certain words of our Lord respecting marriage and celibacy in such passages as Matt. xix. 10—12, and

young man expected to be mentioned. This answer of Jesus is earnest; for to love is to live!" Godet on Luke xviii. 20.

[1] Or as S. Matthew records, Εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι = *if thou art resolved to be perfect.*

[2] "Undoubtedly, according to the view of Jesus, man cannot do more or better than fulfil the Law (Matt. v. 17, 48). Only the Law must be obeyed not in the letter but in the spirit. The perfection to which Jesus called the young man is not the fulfilling of law *superior* to the Law strictly so called, but the real fulfilling, in opposition to that external, literal fulfilling which the young man already had. This one thing which he lacks is the *spirit* of the Law, that is love ready to give everything: this is the whole of the Law (Luke vi.)." Godet on Luke xviii. 21.

[3] Comp. S. Aug. *de Sancta Virginitate*, cp. 30; "Non enim sicut *Non mœchaberis, non occides*, ita dici potest, non nubes. Illa exiguntur, ista offeruntur. Si fiunt ista, laudantur; nisi fiunt illa, damnantur. In illis Dominus debitum imperat vobis; in his autem si quid amplius *supererogaveritis*, in redeundo reddit vobis."

[4] This is further illustrated by the sequel, for when the young man heard our Lord's reply *his countenance fell at the saying and*, we are told, *he went away sorrowful* (Mark x. 22, R.V.), and our Lord commenting on his conduct said, *It is hard for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven* (Matt. xix. 23). It was unfitness for the kingdom of heaven, not unfitness for the highest place therein, which the young ruler displayed, when he failed to sell all that he had and give to the poor.

of S. Paul in 1 Cor. vii. 1—7, 25—40. But it is to be observed that, while both our Lord and S. Paul regard the celibate life and abstinence from marriage as deserving of all commendation in certain cases and for certain definite ends, where *men are able to receive it*[1] (Matt. xix. 11), yet in other places the highest praise is bestowed upon the holy estate of matrimony. And while it is admitted that it is well to adopt the celibate life, if men wish to avoid entangling themselves with earthly ties and worldly business, yet nowhere is any hint dropped that by such abstinence from wedlock men do *more* than win their own salvation, or that celibacy has *in itself* a special merit, or can confer a higher place in heaven.

vi. The Teaching of the Article. Respecting this doctrine of Works of Supererogation the Article lays down (1) that it "cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety," and (2) that it plainly contradicts the clear declaration of Christ Himself. It cannot be taught without *arrogancy*, for it is utterly opposed to the humility, which Christ requires of all His disciples, and it cannot be taught without *impiety*, for it tends to detract from the all-sufficient merits of His atoning Sacrifice. Moreover it plainly contradicts His own words, for He expressly declared to His Apostles, *When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do* (Luke xvii. 10)[2].

[1] Οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι τὸν λόγον τοῦτον (Matt. xix. 11). All cannot *receive*, all are not capable of *holding*, i.e. of *observing* τὸν λόγον τοῦτον, this precept, viz. about celibacy, but only some οἷς δέδοται. For χωροῦσι comp. John ii. 6; xxi. 25.

[2] "Unprofitable servants! What but unprofitable servants can we repute ourselves, when we measure our

vii. **Conclusion.** If, then, as we have seen, it is the teaching of Revelation that the taint of original sin remains even "in them that are regenerated," and thus vitiates any claim that may be set up for good works done by us apart from Grace, it is plain *à fortiori* that no amount of human obedience can render unto God more than He may demand, or more than man of his bounden duty is required to offer. We need not, indeed, hesitate to believe that special acts of self-renunciation, special acts of charity, undertaken for the love of God, may by God's Grace be attended with special rewards in the life to come[1]. But the idea that a man can attain such a degree of supereminent merit that the excess can be made available for others, is unsupported by any teaching in Holy Scripture. We cannot conceive of any, even the most eminent saint, attaining to a higher degree of sanctity than is set forth by our Lord, not as a counsel of perfection, but as a precept for daily life, *Ye therefore shall be perfect*[2], *as your heavenly Father is perfect* (Matt. v. 48).

very best performances with that which God requires of us: when we call to mind that nothing short of the perfection of God is the standard whereby we shall be measured, and that in Him lie hidden not only all possible perfections that are or ever have been in any of His creatures, but that beyond that there is the inscrutable perfection which is His own attribute... Unprofitable servants! What but unprofitable, in view of the truth that God needs not one of us, that He is in Himself complete in all things, and that the addition or subtraction of a universe adds nothing to, takes nothing from His perfection." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, pp. 214, 215.

[1] We may note in this connection the inherent value of sacrifice. "The good to be sought is not made up of pleasures, nor the evil to be avoided made up of pains. The end for the which sacrifice is demanded is one which in the sacrifice itself is in some measure attained ... the individual's sacrifice of an inclination, harmless or even in its way laudable, for the sake of a higher good, is itself already in some measure an attainment of the higher good." Green, *Proleg. Eth.*, p. 420, Ed. 1884.

[2] The future here has an imperative force, ἔσεσθε τέλειοι. The latter word is limited by the preceding words=perfect in respect of love, i.e. "love your enemies as well as your neighbours," because your Father, being perfect in respect of love, doeth this.

Article XV.

1563.

Nemo præter Christum sine peccato.

Christus in nostræ naturæ ueritate per omnia similis factus est nobis, excepto peccato, à quo prorsus erat immunis, tum in carne tum in spiritu. Venit, ut Agnus absque macula esset, qui mundi peccata per immolationem sui semel factam, tolleret: et peccatum (ut inquit Ioannes) in eo non erat. Sed nos reliqui, etiam baptizati, et in Christo regenerati, in multis tamen offendimus omnes: Et si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus, nos ipsos seducimus, et veritas in nobis non est.

1571.

Of Christe alone without sinne.

Christe in the trueth of our nature, was made lyke vnto vs in al thinges (sinne only except) from which he was clearley voyde, both in his fleshe, and in his spirite. He came to be the lambe without spot, who by the sacrifice of hym self once made, shoulde take away the sinnes of the worlde: and sinne, (as S. John sayeth) was not in hym. But al we the rest, (although baptized, and borne agayne in Christe) yet offende in many thinges, and if we say we haue no sinne, we deceaue our selues, and the trueth is not in vs.

i. **Connection.** The Fifteenth Article supplements and strengthens the one which goes before it. The idea of "works of supererogation" arose in a great measure, as we have seen, out of the admiration of the early Church for martyrs and martyrdom, and out of the surpassing virtues of many eminent saints. Men, truly holy men, were addressed in terms, which bordered strongly on those which Scripture applies to Christ Himself. It was very necessary, therefore, to remind men, as this Article does, of *His* incomparable perfections.

ii. **Object.** Its object, then, is to show that while the taint of sin, which man carries with him from his cradle to his grave, vitiates the good works even of the most saintly,

there is one and one only exception to the law of universal sinfulness, and that is our Divine Redeemer.

iii. **Analysis.** Respecting our Lord the Article asserts

(α) That "in the truth of our nature"[1] He "was made like unto us in all things," sin only excepted, from which He was absolutely free[2], both in His flesh, and in His spirit;

(β) That being free from sin, He could be, and came into the world to be, "the Lamb without spot, who by the sacrifice[3] of Himself once made, should take away the sins of the world," and sin was not in Him[4];

(γ) That as for the rest of mankind, so far from our being able to do works of supereminent merit, we are not able to satisfy the ordinary requirements of God's Law, and although baptized and regenerated in Christ, yet *in many things we offend all* (James iii. 2).

[1] Observe the force of the expression "in nostræ naturæ veritate." As our Lord was "Verus Deus," consubstantial with the Father from all eternity, so He became "Verus Homo," consubstantial with us in all the details of a common humanity. See *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 103, 104. "Our Lord actually assumed our human nature, with all its attributes, its sinless infirmities, its faculties and powers, into His Divine Person, so that as He has become a sharer in our human nature, we have become partakers of the Divine." Bp Forbes, p. 217.

[2] Absolutely free, or "Clearelie uoide," English Version of 1553. Prorsus from *pro*, *versus* = (1) *turned towards*; (2) *in a straight line*; (3) *directly, utterly, absolutely*. Comp. Cic. *de Or.* II. xiv. 61, "verbum *prorsus* nullum intelligo."

[3] Note the word for sacrifice here, *immolationem*. This word from *in* and *mola* denotes (1) literally *the sprinkling of the victim with the salt cake* (mola salsa); (2) *the bringing as an offering*; (3) *a sacrifice*. Comp. Cic. *Div.* i. 52. 119, "In ipso immolationis tempore." Because the sprinkling of the victim in this manner was so important, *immolare* could be used to express the entire action of sacrifice, including the slaying and burning on the altar. See Freeman's *Principles of Divine Service*, ii. p. 76.

[4] See 1 John iii. 5, ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστι. "The tense (*is* not *was*) marks the eternal character of the Redeemer. All that belongs to His 'perfected' Manhood (Heb. ii. 10, v. 9) 'is' in Him no less than His unchanged Divinity." Westcott *in loc.*

iv. **Scripture Proof of the first Statement.** Scripture clearly teaches us that our Lord assumed our humanity with all its attributes, faculties, and powers, so that no one element of human nature was wanting to it[1]. But though He took upon Him our nature, it was not essential that He should take upon Him our sinfulness, for sin is not a part but "the fault and corruption" of our nature. That He "was made like unto us in all things," sin only excepted, is the testimony alike of the Gospels and Epistles:—

(i) *Of the Gospels:* For

(α) When the angel Gabriel announced to the Blessed Virgin that *the Holy Ghost should come upon her, and the power of the Highest should overshadow her*, he adds, *wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God* (Luke i. 35)[2];

(β) And as He grew up to man's estate, it is distinctly said of Him that He *advanced*, not only in *wisdom and stature*, but *in favour with God and men* (Luke ii. 52)[3];

(γ) During His earthly Ministry not only does He never hint that He has taught, or said, or done anything which needs forgiveness[4], but

[1] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 109, 110.

[2] Διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον [ἐκ σοῦ] ἅγιον κληθήσεται Υἱὸς Θεοῦ. See the R.V. here. "Entering into human life in this way, Our Lord was placed in the normal condition of man before his fall, and put in a position to fulfil the career originally set before man, in which He was to advance from innocence to holiness." Godet *in loc.*

[3] Προέκοπτε σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ χάριτι παρὰ Θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις, Luke ii. 52. Προέκοπτε, note the force of the imperfect tense. His advance was natural, not premature, or forced. "In virtue of His own holy nature, He repelled the impure and sinful as alien to His very being from childhood upwards, and received and appropriated only what would serve as an element for His normal development." Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 278.

[4] He teaches His disciples to pray *Forgive us our debts*, but "we never hear from His lips confession of sin

He declares positively *I do always the things that are pleasing to Him* [*My Father*[1]] (John viii. 29), and He challenges those who had known intimately His going out and His coming in, saying, *Which of you convicteth Me of sin?* (John viii. 46);

(δ) Nay, at the most solemn crisis of His life, and in the prospect of a cruel and ignominious death, He affirms, *The Prince of this world cometh: and he hath nothing in Me*[2] (John xiv. 30):

(ii) *Of the Epistles:* For

(*a*) S. Peter says of Him that He was *the Holy and Righteous One* (Acts iii. 14), that He *did no sin, neither was guile found in His mouth* (1 Pet. ii. 22)[3];

(*b*) S. Paul says, *Him, Who knew no sin, God made sin on our behalf* (2 Cor. v. 21);

(*c*) And S. John writes, *He was manifested to take away sins*[4]; *and in Him is no sin* (1 John iii. 5).

and sorrow on account of any contradiction between what He was and what He should have been—a confession, a sorrow, which we hear from all the noblest and best of men." Ibid. p. 287; see also Liddon's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 246—250, Ed. 1877.

[1] Ἐγὼ τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ πάντοτε, John viii. 29; the emphasis here is on ἐγὼ, in mournful contrast to the Jews, and on πάντοτε (*on every occasion*), which stands last in the sentence. The theory that Jesus was merely the holiest and noblest of teachers, shatters against such words as these. What saint or prophet ever dared to say, "The things that are pleasing to God I in every instance do"? and yet "Hæc summa cum suavitate dixit Dominus." Bengel.

[2] Ἔρχεται γὰρ ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων· καὶ ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν. "Οὐδὲν ἔχειν signifies to have neither right nor power over the object of his hatred. This saying implied in Him Who pronounced it, a consciousness of perfect innocence." Godet *in loc.*

[3] On the special force of the testimony of the companions of our Lord's earthly ministry see a striking sermon of Professor Mozley, *Parochial and Occasional Sermons*, p. 278 sqq.

[4] Ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ = "*that He may take away sins*, not simply do away with the punishment of them." "Tollit autem et dimittendo quæ facta

These passages make it clear that our Lord was a perfect representative of our race, that of our nature He was a partaker in everything that constitutes complete manhood, excepting only that which was no proper part but only the fault and corruption of our nature, namely, sin[1].

v. **Scripture Proof of the Second Statement.** From the dogmatic statement of our Lord's perfect sinlessness the Article, "rising into something like religious fervour[2]," proceeds to affirm that He came to be "the Lamb without spot," the Eternal Victim for sin. Under the old Law the typical lamb of the Jewish Passover was required to be without spot or blemish (Exod. xii. 5), but the priest himself was compassed about with sinful infirmity. He had therefore to offer both *for his own sins and the sins of the people* (Heb. v. 2, 3). Under the New Dispensation, on the other hand, the functions of offerer and oblation met and were united in the spotless Person of our Lord, who was

"Himself the Victim, and Himself the Priest."

Hence He could say with absolute truth at the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, *This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins* (Matt. xxvi. 28)[3], and the sinless nature of our Divine Redeemer supplied His special aptitude for that sacrificial function, which He commenced when He offered up Himself upon the altar of His Cross, and which He now continues in that world,

sunt et adjuvando ne fiant et perducendo ad vitam ubi fieri omnino non possint." Bede quoted by Westcott *in loc.*, who observes that the use of the plural "sins" (*τὰς ἁμαρτίας*) brings out "the manifold personal realisations of the sin of humanity which Christ takes away. The phrase stands without further definition (*sins*, not *our sins*) in order to include the fulness of the truth expressed in 1 Joh. ii. 2."

[1] See Article II. pp. 51, 52.

[2] Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 221.

[3] Hence also S. Peter can say, *Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, with silver or gold,...but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, (even the blood) of Christ*, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19: comp. also Hebrews viii. 26—28.

whither He is gone, and where His glorious Body pleads "without words" by its very presence within the true Holy of Holies the efficacy of His one perfect sacrifice.

vi. **Scripture Proof of the Third Statement.** The Article now proceeds to assert in broad terms the actual sinfulness of all the rest of mankind. This has been already stated in the Ninth Article. Here it will be sufficient to assert that according to the teaching of Scripture, in spite of the fact that by Baptism we have been born again in Christ and placed in a state of Grace, yet, as a matter of fact, we all *offend in many things* (Jas. iii. 2)[1]. In many respects we do not live up to our profession, nor avail ourselves of God's promised aid to resist temptation as it arises. And therefore Christ has taught us in His Pattern Prayer to pray daily that God will *forgive us our trespasses*[2], that "as we through the frailty of our nature are always subject unto sin, so we should always exercise the acts of repentance, and for ever seek the favour of God[3]," for, as S. John reminds us, *If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; if we confess our sins, God*[4] *is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness* (1 John i. 8, 9).

vii. **Apparent Exceptions.** It is to be noticed that the Article does not speak of any exceptional cases. It says "all we the rest." But it has sometimes been asked,

[1] Πολλὰ γὰρ πταίομεν ἅπαντες (Jas. iii. 2). Note the emphasis on the ἅπαντες, as indicated by its position.

[2] "Remissio peccatorum una est, quæ semel datur in sancto Baptismate: alia, quæ quamdiu vivimus pie, datur in Dominica Oratione." S. Aug. *de Serm. Dom.* lvi. 13.

[3] Pearson *On the Creed*, Art. x. p. 620, Oxf. Ed.

[4] Πιστός ἐστιν. "The subject (God) is necessarily supplied from the context...The epithet 'faithful' (πιστός) is applied to God not unfrequently in the Pauline epistles as being One who will fulfil His promises (Heb. x. 23, xi. 11), and complete what He has begun (1 Thess. v. 24; 1 Cor. i. 9), and guard those who trust in Him (1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 13), because this is His nature; comp. 1 Pet. iv. 19." Westcott *in loc.*

Are not Zacharias and Elizabeth spoken of as *blameless*, (Luke i. 6), and does not S. Paul speak of himself as *having lived in all good conscience before God?* (Acts xxiii. 1). To this it may be replied:—

(α) It is true that S. Luke tells us that Zacharias and Elizabeth were *both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless* (Luke i. 6). But the blamelessness here spoken of is not a moral but a legal blamelessness, and the righteousness alluded to is not a moral but a ceremonial righteousness. Zacharias could not have attained to a moral perfection, or he would not have disbelieved the angel, when he promised him a son, and so have incurred the penalty of dumbness for his want of faith[1].

(β) Again, when S. Paul says of himself that *up to this day* he deemed himself to *have lived before God in all good conscience* (Acts xxiii. 1), and that *as touching the righteousness which is of the Law he was found blameless*[2] (Phil. iii. 6), he does not mean to represent that he was morally perfect, otherwise he never would have said that he found it necessary to *buffet his body, and bring it into bondage* (1 Cor. ix. 27), and he never would have spoken of himself, when Paul the aged and Paul the prisoner, as *not counting himself yet to have apprehended*, but as still *forgetting the things*

[1] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 351.

[2] Γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος=*one who in the result was, and so one who was found or proved blameless.* The phrase suggests the inspection of a sacrificial victim by a μωμόσκοπος and its recognition as ἄμωμος, *free from legal blemish.* The same verbal adjective is used in Luke i. 6.

which were behind, and stretching forward to the things that were before (Phil. iii. 13).

viii. **The Blessed Virgin.** In making the statements which it does, the Article also denies by implication the Scholastic dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin[1], which asserted that she was not only conspicuously holy, but, like her Divine Son, free from the taint not merely of actual but also of original sin. The development of the doctrine admits of division into distinct historical epochs:

(*a*) During the first four centuries there is little to be found on the subject[2]. S. Cyril of Jerusalem, though he dwells much on the birth of our Lord from a pure Virgin, and gives His Mother the title of *Theotokos*, is absolutely silent as to her Immaculate Conception;

(*b*) The first germ of the doctrine appears in a scruple expressed by S. Augustine[3] as to discussing the question of her liability to sin. "Concerning the Virgin Mary," he writes, "I am not willing for the honour of our Lord that any dispute be held, when we are speaking about sin. For how do we know what more Grace was bestowed on her to overcome all sin, who had the honour to conceive and bring forth Him Who certainly had no sin?"

(*c*) From a scruple the idea passed into a *pious*

[1] See Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 402, Ed. 1890.

[2] For the opinions of Church teachers in the fourth century see Gieseler's *Church History*, ii. p. 35, and the notes.

[3] "Excepta itaque sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quæstionem: unde enim scimus, quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum, quæ concipere ac parere meruit quem constat nullum habuisse peccatum?" S. Aug. *De Natura et Gratia*, xxxvi.

opinion, confined to a few of the faithful, and expressing a *speculation* rather than a doctrine;

(*d*) In the course of the twelfth century[1] it gained authority as a *dogma*, and as such was introduced by the Canons of Lyons into their ecclesiastical offices, A.D. 1136. But when in A.D. 1140 they proceeded to institute a special Festival in honour of the doctrine, Bernard of Clairvaux[2], clearly perceiving that thus the specific difference between our Saviour and the rest of mankind was endangered, strongly opposed both the new doctrine and the Festival, and complained that so respected a Church as that of Lyons "should have introduced what was unknown to Church practice, unapproved by reason, and uncommended by ancient tradition[3]."

(*e*) The Festival[4], however, spread with the deepening devotion to the Virgin, though the Schoolmen Albert the Great, Bonaventura[5], S. Thomas Aquinas[6], and the Dominicans generally were

[1] The controversy on the Immaculate Conception was preceded by that carried on between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus concerning the virginity of S. Mary. See Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ii. p. 262.

[2] See Bernardi *Ep.* 174 *ad Canonicos Lugdunenses*, quoted by Gieseler, ii. 2. s. 429. S. Bernard admitted that S. Mary was sanctified in the womb, but he did not from this draw the inference that she was free from original sin. Comp. Milman's *Latin Christianity*, ix. 75, Ed. 1872, and Gieseler, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 345.

[3] See Hagenbach, *Hist. Doct.* ii. p. 261.

[4] In the thirteenth century it was widely observed, but only as a Festum *Conceptionis* in general, and not as the Festum Conceptionis *Immaculatæ*. In the English Calendar it was included for the first time by Archbp Islip's Constitutions, A.D. 1362, though it has been asserted that it was so included at Archbp Langton's Council at Oxford, A.D. 1222.

[5] "Teneamus," writes Bonaventura, "secundum quod communis opinio tenet, Virginis sanctificationem fuisse *post* originalis peccati contractionem." *Sent.* lib. iii. dist. 3, art. i. qu. 2.

[6] S. Thomas's view is (i) That there was a *sanctificatio* "in utero a peccato originali, quantum ad maculam personalem," but not a *liberatio* "a reatu, quo tota natura tenebatur obnoxia"; (ii) That this *sanctificatio* was an

zealous in opposition. Even Duns Scotus, who endeavoured to defend the novel doctrine by subtle reasoning, only maintained that it was the more probable among the different possibilities[1]. The Church for a long time hesitated without coming to a decision, and at the Council of Trent the doctrine became the subject of such keen dispute, that the Pope was obliged to forbid any further discussion, lest it should lead to an open schism. Finally a compromise was effected, and in the decree it was laid down that the Council had no intention to include the Blessed Virgin in the consequences of original sin.

(*f*) Since then the Dogma has been awakened from the slumber into which it seemed to have sunk, and was brought to a definite decision by the Bull of Pope Pius IX., Dec. 8, 1854, yet not without serious objections and opposition even within the Latin Church itself.

ix. **The Teaching of the Church of England** respecting the honour due to the Blessed Virgin has always been marked by sobriety and reverence. She does not hesitate to ascribe to her the highest conceivable dignity, considering the ineffable privilege which was conferred upon her. She preserves two red letter, and three black letter Festivals in her memory[2], and in the Collect for Christmas

"*emundatio* a peccato originali"; "culpa autem non potest emundari, nisi per gratiam, cujus subjectum est sola creatura rationalis." Thus he holds that Christ was her Saviour. *Summ.* III. Qu. 27, Art. ii.

[1] "Deus potuit facere quod ipsa nunquam fuisset in peccato originali; potuit etiam fecisse ut tantum in uno instanti esset in peccato; potuit etiam facere ut per tempus aliquod esset in peccato et in ultimo illius temporis purgaretur." *Sent.* lib. iii. dist. 3, qu. 1.

[2] The Purification of the Virgin on Feb. 2; the Annunciation on March 25. She also preserves in her Calendar the Black Letter Days, the Conception on

Day dwells on our Lord's birth of a "pure Virgin," and in the Proper Preface for the day asserts that He "was made very Man of the substance of the Virgin Mary His Mother, and that without spot of sin[1]." But she nowhere inculcates as a matter of faith the suspension in the case of the Virgin of the law of the Fall, nor holds that by reason of her Immaculate Conception she was absolutely free from original sin. If the doctrine in such a sense is true, it not only exempts the Blessed Virgin from all original taint, but places her in a sphere by herself beyond the common need of salvation[2]. The regeneration of the world is thus made to begin not with our Lord, but with her, and instead of springing sinless out of the sinful race He came to save[3], He derives His Humanity from something *not* like unto the rest of us, and thus His human sanctity becomes in a way dependent on hers and a consequence of it[4].

Dec. 8; the Nativity on Sep. 8; and the Visitation of the B. Virgin on July 2.

[1] Again in the "Homily of Repentance" she speaks of Jesus Christ, "who being true and natural God, did at the time appointed take upon Him our frail nature in the Blessed Virgin's womb, and that of *her undefiled substance*, so that He might be a Mediator between God and us."

[2] The comment of S. Thomas Aquinas on the hypothesis that "*ante animationem* beata Virgo sanctificata fuisset" is "nunquam incurrisset maculam originis culpæ; et ita non indiguisset redemptione et salute, quæ est per Christum." *Summ.* III. Qu. 27, Art. ii.

[3] We find no trace of the doctrine in the Gospels or Epistles. S. Matthew, who gives us his genealogy of our Lord, records amongst the only ancestresses whom he mentions, the names of the incestuous Tamar (Matt. i. 3), and the harlot Rahab (Matt. i. 4), of the heatheness Ruth (Matt. i. 5) and the adulterous wife of Uriah (Matt. i. 6). "The purity of the last stage in the transmission was not actually more necessary to our Lord's incorruption than that of the earlier stages." Mason's *Faith of the Gospels*, p. 129, Ed. 2.

[4] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, pp. 352—354, and Bp Forbes, pp. 226, 227. The Bonn Conference in 1874 rejected the doctrine "as being contrary to the tradition of the first thirteen centuries, according to which Christ alone is conceived without sin." See the *Report of the Conference*, pp. 55—60.

ARTICLE XVI.

1563.

De Lapsis post Baptismum.

Non omne peccatum mortale post baptismum uoluntariè perpetratum, est peccatum in Spiritum sanctum et irremissibile. Proinde lapsis à baptismo in peccata, locus pœnitentiæ non est negandus. Post acceptum spiritum sanctum, possumus à gratia data recedere atque peccare, denuóque per gratiam Dei resurgere ac resipiscere. Ideóque illi damnandi sunt, qui se quamdiu hic viuant, amplius non posse peccare affirmant, aut verè resipiscentibus pœnitentiæ locum denegant.

1571.

Of sinne after Baptisme.

Not euery deadly sinne willingly committed after baptisme, is sinne agaynst the holy ghost, and vnpardonable. Wherefore, the graunt of repentaunce is not to be denyed to such as fal into sinne after baptisme. After we haue receaued the holy ghost, we may depart from grace geuen, and fall into sinne, and by the grace of God (we may) aryse agayne and amend our lyues. And therefore, they are to be condemned, whiche say they can no more sinne as long as they lyue here, or denie the place of forgeuenesse to such as truely repent.

i. **Connection.** But if Christ is alone without spot of sin, and we are pure only so far as we partake of His purity, what is to be said of those who, after being made members of His Body by Baptism, commit deadly sin? Are we to hold, as some did in the early Church, and as some taught in the sixteenth century[1], that for such there is no hope of pardon? Or are we to believe that a man once reconciled to God and admitted into Covenant with Him, cannot fall from Grace given?

ii. **The Title.** To both these questions the Sixteenth Article contains an answer. Its present Title, however,

[1] See Hardwick, *Articles*, pp. 88, 100.

differs considerably from that which it bore in 1563, when it ran "De lapsis post Baptismum," "Concerning those who have fallen after Baptism," and still more from the Title which it bore in 1553, "De Peccato in Spiritum Sanctum," "Concerning Sin against the Holy Ghost." The present Title is a more general one, "De Peccato post Baptismum," "Of Sin after Baptism."

iii. **The Erroneous Views** held on this subject in the early Church were those of the Montanists and Novatians:—

(α) The Montanists regarded it as their special task to reform Christian Life and Church discipline, in view of the expected second Coming of our Lord, and they held that the Church had no right to grant assurance of forgiveness to those who had broken their Baptismal vows by grievous sin[1];

(β) The Novatians, who derived their name from Novatian, a presbyter of Rome in the third century, taught that every mortal sin committed after Baptism is unpardonable, and that, therefore, the lapsed, or those who had fallen into apostasy during the Decian persecution, had no more hope of salvation, and could not be restored to the Church[2].

iv. **The same Erroneous Views** were reproduced in the sixteenth century by a section of the Anabaptists, who appeared in great numbers in Essex and Kent[3]. They taught that all hope of pardon is taken away from those,

[1] Tertullian, *De Pudicitia*, c. 21. Cheetham, *First Six Centuries*, p. 94.

[2] Comp. the words of the Augsburg Confession, Art. xii. "Damnantur et Novatiani, qui nolebant absolvere lapsos post baptismum redeuntes ad pœnitentiam." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 127.

[3] Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 88, where we have a letter from Bp Hooper to Bullinger, June 25, 1549, describing the appearance of the Anabaptists in England.

who fall into sin after having received the Holy Ghost, and at the same time held that a man once reconciled to God "is without sin, and free from all stain of concupiscence, and that nothing of the old Adam remains in his nature; and a man, they say, who is thus regenerate, cannot sin[1]."

v. **Analysis.** In opposition to such views the Article asserts

(1) That "not every deadly sin[2] willingly committed after Baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable";

(2) That "the grant of repentance[3] is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism";

(3) That "after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and rise again and amend our lives[4]," and that "they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent."

vi. **Scripture Proof.** The remissibility of sin[5] after

[1] "Damnat Anabaptistas, qui negant semel justificatos posse amittere Spiritum Sanctum. Item qui contendunt quibusdam tantam perfectionem in hac vita contingere, ut peccare non possint." Confess. Aug. Art. xii. *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 127.

[2] *Peccatum mortale.* This expression is grounded on the words 1 John v. 16. It does not mean a sin committed in weakness or through the violence of some sudden temptation, but a sin committed wilfully, with the full consent of the will (voluntarie), and a consciousness of the guilt of the act.

[3] *Locus pœnitentiæ* seems to be derived from *μεταvολας τόπος* in Heb. xii. 17. It was a Roman law term. In 1553 it was translated "the place for penitents," alluding to the custom in the early Church of reserving a place as far as possible from the altar for penitents, before they were received back into full communion by the Bishop or other authorities of the Church.

[4] *Resipiscere*, from re and sapere= (1) *to taste again*; (2) *to recover one's senses, to come to oneself again*, comp. Plautus *Mil. Glor.* iv. 8. 24, "Afferte aquam dum resipiscit"; (3) *to become reasonable, to repent* or *amend.*

[5] The remissibility of post-Baptismal sin is essential to Christianity as (*a*) *A Paternal Religion*, for the God of Christianity is a Father; His forbearance (Rom. ii. 4) and His punishment (Ps. xcix. 8) are both alike evidence of His care for His children

Baptism may be deduced from the teaching (1) of our Lord, and (2) of His Apostles:—

(*a*) *The teaching of our Lord:*

(1) When the Apostles asked Him to teach them to pray, He gave them the Lord's Prayer, and in it He taught them, as He teaches us, to say *Forgive us our sins; for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us* (Luke xi. 4). He nowhere limits these words, or tells us that under certain circumstances the baptized children of God may not use this Prayer, because forgiveness is impossible;

(2) Again in the Parable of the Prodigal Son He describes how not a stranger but a *son* left his father's house, and went into a far country, and there wasted his substance in riotous living, and yet on his repentance was welcomed home and pardoned (Luke xv. 11—32);

(3) He gave to His Apostles the power of *binding and loosing* (Matt. xviii. 18), and He ratified this gift after He rose from the dead, saying, *Whosesoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained* (John xx. 23). He nowhere hints that the Grace of forgiveness does not apply to those who sin after Baptism.

(Ps. cili. *passim*; 1 Pet. v. 7); it is also essential to it as (*b*) *An Idealistic Religion;* the Founder of Christianity has been the most powerful, because the most tranquil exponent of the view that "morality is the nature of things," that "the highest ideal is at the same time the deepest reality of the world." Such idealism constitutes a religion of hope, immeasurably the more hopeful, where "Love comes to quicken hope." John iii. 16, 17; Rom. v. 5 *sqq.* See Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, ii. pp. 139, 275; Fowle, *Why do men remain Christians? Contemp. Review*, p. 120, Jan. 1893.

(β) *The teaching of the Apostles:*

(1) Here S. Peter naturally claims the first place, for not only had he himself been forgiven after a fall, which might well have been believed to place him beyond the power of absolution, but we find him extending the hope of pardon even to Simon Magus[1]. This man had been baptized (Acts viii. 13), and yet was declared by the Apostle to be *in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity* (Acts viii. 23). Nevertheless S. Peter urges him to repentance, and bids him pray *the Lord, if perhaps the thought of his heart shall be forgiven him* (Acts viii. 22);

(2) Again S. Paul was confronted at Corinth with an instance of gross immorality, and he passes on the offender the sentence of excommunication (1 Cor. v. 1—8). But when the incestuous person has given proof of his sorrow and repentance, the Apostle orders him to be restored to communion, *lest he should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow*[2] (2 Cor. ii. 7). So also the same Apostle exhorts the Galatians, *if a man be overtaken in any trespass,* to *restore such a one in a spirit of meekness* (Gal. vi. 1)[3];

(3) In like manner S. John, writing to baptized Christians, exhorts them, on the one hand,

[1] On the case of Simon Magus see Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxvi. 2, and comp. 2 Pet. iii. 9.

[2] And the Apostle declares that the very object he had in view, when he passed the sentence, was *that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus* (1 Cor. v. 5).

[3] Ἐὰν καὶ προληφθῇ, *et si præoccupatus fuerit* Vulg., *supposing a man should be even taken before he could escape,* flagrante delicto.

not to sin[1], and on the other bids them, if they fall into sin, not to despair, for *we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He*[2] *is the propitiation for our sins* (1 John ii. 1, 2).

vii. **Objections.** But it is urged that certain passages seem to militate against this view of the remissibility of post-Baptismal sin. Thus our Lord says, *Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven...but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come* (Matt. xii. 31, 32). Now here it is to be observed that

(*a*) This awful warning arose out of the fact that the Pharisees had dared to ascribe our Lord's miracles of mercy to Satan and Beelzebub (Matt. xii. 24), rather than allow that He, Who wrought them, was that which He claimed to be;

(*b*) Our Lord does not affirm that even they *had* committed sin against the Holy Spirit, though doubtless they were *very near* committing it[3];

(*c*) He mercifully warns them of the peril, which they were bringing upon themselves, and of the

[1] Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ ἁμάρτητε, *ut non peccetis* Vulg., *that ye may not sin.* "The thought is of the single act (ἁμάρτητε) not of the state (ἁμαρτάνητε);...the single act, into which the believer may be carried...as contrasted with the habitual state." See Westcott *in loc.*

[2] Καὶ αὐτός, *et ipse* Vulg. *and He*, or rather, *and He Himself.* "The emphatic pronoun enforces the thought of the efficacy of Christ's advocacy as 'righteous.' He who pleads our cause, having fulfilled the destiny of man, is at the same time the propitiation for our sins." Westcott *in loc.*

[3] "To speak against the Holy Ghost is to speak against the clear voice of conscience, to call good evil and light darkness, to pursue goodness as such with malignity and hatred. Such sin, or sinful state, cannot be forgiven since from its very nature it excludes the idea of repentance. Jesus, who saw the heart, knew that the Pharisees were insincere in the charge which they brought against Him. They were attributing to Satan what they knew to be the work of God." Carr on Matt. xii. 32.

desperate *state of sin*[1], into which they might fall. Now He would scarce have done this, if there was in their present state no hope that they could repent, no possibility of their being forgiven.

viii. **Objections continued.** Again the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews affirms

(*a*) *As touching those who were once enlightened, and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and fell away*[2], *it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame* (Heb. vi. 4—6).

Now here we have to notice

(1) That the sin spoken of as "falling away" is not a lapse into moral guilt[3], but a *positive* and *continuous* apostasy from the Christian faith[4];

(2) That the impossibility here asserted is not

[1] In the strictly theological sense Mortal Sin *itself is* a *state*, not an *act*, e.g. "quod aliquis non *habitualiter* referat se et omnia sua in Deum," and thus an act *of* Mortal Sin as distinct from *a* Venial Sin is an "actus *deliberatus ratione*." Yet even such a state "reparari potest...per virtutem divinam." Comp. S. Thom. Aquinas, *Summ.* ii. 1, Qu. 88. 1, 2.

[2] "This brief clause bears the whole weight of the terrible contrast between the past state, with its many gracious particulars, and the lapse from it. *All these experiences of grace—and all forfeited!*" Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] Παραπεσόντας; "post tanta dona." Corn. a Lapide *in loc.* The term is a strong one. See Rom. xi. 11 where πίπτω as contrasted with πταίω implies an irreparable fall. "It is the final throwing away of grace, not any one sin of exceptional heinousness, which is the subject of all these passages." Vaughan *in loc.*

[4] For the word Φωτισθέντας became in Christian usage a constant term for conversion to the Christian faith. Hence Φωτισμός became almost synonymous with Holy Baptism from the time of Justin Martyr downwards (*Apol.* i. 61, 65). The Syriac Versions give this sense here. Pesh. *who have once descended to baptism*; Hcl. *who have once been baptized.* Comp. Westcott *in loc.*

that of a single renewal, but of an indefinitely repeated renewal[1] of those, who persist in turning their backs on the one appointed way of salvation, and in neglecting the ordained means of grace;

(β) In another passage, again, of the same Epistle the writer asserts that *if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more a sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful expectation of judgement, and a fierceness of fire which shall devour the adversaries* (Heb. x. 26, 27).

Here again applying the same rule of interpretation we observe

(1) That the sin alluded to is not a sudden lapse, but a wilful and continuous persistence in a course of sin[2];

(2) That this continuous persistence in sin[3] is understood to follow a more advanced knowledge[4] than a simple acquaintance with the primary elements of the Faith;

[1] "The distinction between the present and aorist tenses is conspicuous throughout the passage. The aorists φωτισθέντας, γευσαμένους, γενηθέντας, παραπεσόντας indicate single acts. The presents ἀνακαινίζειν, ἀνασταυροῦντας, παραδειγματίζοντας point not to single acts, but to a continued state of hard-heartedness, revealing itself in successive acts and thus becoming habitual. There is an active continuous hostility implied in the souls of such men. The present participles bring out the moral cause of the impossibility which has been affirmed." Westcott *in loc.*

[2] "To sin Ἑκουσίως is to sin not under the constraining force of sudden temptation acting upon the weakness of the mortal nature, but (as Psalm xxv. 3 expresses it) *without cause* (διακενῆς LXX.), that is, by free choice and will." Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] Ἑκουσίως ἁμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν = *if we wilfully persist in sin, voluntarie peccantibus nobis.* Vulg. The present tense deserves all attention. Two distinct elements are indicated by the phrase employed, (1) the voluntariness, that is the realised consciousness, and (2) the habitual indulgence in the sin. Comp. Westcott *in loc.*

[4] Μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας. Ἐπίγνωσις it is to be observed, not γνῶσις. The knowledge received is treated as complete, and the word ἐπίγνωσις marks the great-

(3) That it is not said that for such there is no more forgiveness possible, but that there remaineth no more *a sacrifice for sins*[1]. The one true Sacrifice has been offered up once for all. He who by wilful and persistent sin cuts himself off from the communion of the Church, cuts himself off from that one Sacrifice, that one Source of forgiveness, and this cannot but end in *a certain fearful expectation of judgment*, and righteous retribution on the part of a holy God.

(γ) Once more in the same Epistle we are told respecting *Esau, who for one mess of meat*[2] *sold his own birthright, that even when he afterward*[3] *desired to inherit the blessing, he was rejected* (*for he found no place of repentance*), *though he sought it diligently with tears* (Heb. xii. 16, 17);

Now here it is clear

(1) That if the writer meant to assert that Esau earnestly sought to repent, but could not, then he is contradicting the whole tenour of the Scriptures and of the Gospel;

ness of the fall which is contemplated. Comp. Westcott *in loc.* On γνῶσις and ἐπίγνωσις see *The Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 18 *n.*

[1] The order of the words in the original is remarkable. Περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν stands prominently first, θυσία last; *for sins* there is left *no sacrifice.* "The sacrifice of Christ has been rejected; and there is no other sacrifice which can be effectual." "Non reservatur nobis ultra hostia pro peccato quæ pro nobis offeratur, sicut in veteri lege donatum est hostias sæpe offerre pro peccatis." Primasius quoted by Westcott *in loc.*

[2] Ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς=*for one mess of meat*, Vulg. *propter unam escam.* For a single meal. It was not only for a transitory and material price, but that the smallest, *he sold his own birthright*, τὰ πρωτοτόκια ἑαυτοῦ. Comp. Gen. xxv. 32 *sqq.* Comp. Westcott *in loc.*

[3] Καὶ μετέπειτα. "*Even afterwards.* So long after, that he might have hoped that the early folly was forgotten and done with. The common chronology interposes more than 40 years between the two incidents." Vaughan *in loc.*

(2) That what Esau earnestly desired was a reversal of the *temporal* consequences of his action, an undoing of the effects of what he had done, an obtaining of the blessing in spite of his selling the birthright. This, however, he could not obtain, *though he sought it*[1] *diligently with tears.* The lost blessing could not be won again;

(3) That the consideration of the forgiveness of his sin against God as distinct from the reversal of the *temporal* consequences[2] of his sin, lies wholly outside the argument.

ix. **Final Perseverance.** The second error condemned in the Article is the doctrine that the regenerate cannot fall away from Grace once given, and can no more sin as long as they live; in other words, that Grace is indefectible. As regards this doctrine we have to notice

(α) That the holy angels were not incapable of falling. They kept not *their own estate* or *principality* (Jude 6), but fell away and *await the judgement of the Great Day* (Jude 6);

(β) That our Lord distinctly spoke of (*a*) the good seed *becoming*[3] *unfruitful* (Matt. xiii. 22); (*b*) the salt *losing its savour* (Matt. v. 13); (*c*) the branch being *cast forth* from the vine (John

[1] The ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν must refer to the lost blessing, τὴν εὐλογίαν, not the μετανοίας τόπος. He had sold the right of the firstborn, and yet, as if that were a trivial thing, he claimed to inherit the blessing which belonged to it.

[2] The repentance of Esau was *dolor amissi*, regret for the consequences of his folly, not *dolor admissi*, a godly sorrow for sin, not to be repented of. "There is no pretence for saying that Esau sought *repentance* and could not find it. What Esau sought with tears was the εὐλογία, and to it alone can αὐτήν refer with any shadow of adherence to the history even if spiritualized into allegory. The simple explanation of the difficulty is that the words μετανοίας γὰρ τόπον οὐχ εὗρεν are practically parenthetical to the main sentence." Vaughan *in loc.*

[3] Γίνεται (Matt. xiii. 22)=*resulteth in being, proveth, becometh.*

xv. 6), all which expressions indicate the possibility of a Christian's falling away from Grace once given;

(γ) That S. Paul reminds the Corinthians of the awful warning supplied by the Israelitish nation of the possibility of falling from Grace, for they all enjoyed the highest possible privileges, but, instead of entering the Promised Land, were all, with the exception of two, *overthrown in the wilderness* (1 Cor. x. 1—12). He also distinctly contemplates the possibility of his *becoming a castaway himself* (1 Cor. ix. 27), and, later, in his Epistle to the Philippians speaks of himself as having by no means attained to perfection (Phil. iii. 12, 13);

(δ) Lastly S. Peter, with the remembrance ever before him of his own terrible fall, exhorts the Christians of the Dispersion to *give the more diligence to make their calling and election sure*[1] (2 Pet. i. 10), and he says of those, who, *after escaping the defilements of the world, again become entangled therein and overcome,* that *the last state has become with them worse than the first* (2 Pet. ii. 20)[2].

xi. **Conclusion.** Thus the language of the Article harmonizes with the statements of Holy Scripture, and no less with those of the Prayer-Book. For (*a*) in the Baptismal Office we pray that the child to be admitted into

[1] S. Peter evidently regards "the calling and election" of which he speaks as Divine acts according to the Divine foreknowledge (1 Pet. i. 2). But he is not hindered by any speculative difficulties from admitting that it was in man's power to frustrate both (comp. 2 Cor. vi. 1; Gal. ii. 21), and that effort was required to give them permanent validity. See Prof. Plumptre's note *in loc.*

[2] An obvious reminiscence of our Lord's teaching in Matt. xii. 45.

Christ's Church "may ever *remain* in the number of God's faithful and elect children"; (*b*) in the Catechism the child is taught to pray unto God that he may *continue* in that state of salvation, into which he has been called; (*c*) in the Morning and Evening Prayer we beseech God "not to take His Holy Spirit from us"; (*d*) in the Collect for the thirteenth Sunday after Trinity we pray "that we may so faithfully serve God in this life, that we fail not *finally* to attain His heavenly promises"; and (*e*) in the Burial Office we beseech our "holy and merciful Saviour, our most worthy Judge eternal," that He will "suffer us not, *at our last hour*, for any pains of death, to fall from Him[1]."

[1] It is not intended to deny that there is such a thing as Final Perseverance; on the contrary, it is the Grace of Final Perseverance for which we pray in these and in similar petitions; what *is* denied is the Indefectibility of Grace, a doctrine which (*a*) *theoretically* ignores the fact that the *whole course* of this life is a state of probation, (*b*) *practically* has hindered the growth of moral conduct; "mater negligentiæ solet esse securitas."

ARTICLE XVII.

1563.

De Prædestinatione et Electione.

Prædestinatio ad uitam, est æternum Dei propositum, quo ante iacta mundi fundamenta, suo consilio, nobis quidem occulto, constanter decreuit, eos quos in Christo elegit ex hominum genere, à maledicto et exitio liberare, atque ut uasa in honorem efficta, per Christum ad æternam salutem adducere: Vnde qui tam præclaro Dei beneficio sunt donati, illi spiritu eius opportuno tempore operante, secundum propositum eius uocantur: uocationi per gratiam parent: iustificantur gratis: adoptantur in filios: vnigeniti Iesu Christi imagini efficiuntur conformes: in bonis operibus sanctè ambulant: et demùm ex Dei misericordia pertingunt ad sempiternam fœlicitatem.

Quemadmodum Prædestinationis et Electionis nostræ in Christo pia consideratio, dulcis, suauis et ineffabilis consolationis plena est verè pijs et his qui sentiunt in se uim spiritus CHRISTI, facta carnis et membra quæ adhuc sunt super terram mortificantem, animumque ad cœlestia et superna rapientem, tum quia fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum plurimum stabilit atque confirmat, tum quia amorem nostrum in Deum uehementer accendit: ita hominibus curiosis, carnalibus, et spiritu Christi destitutis, ob oculos perpetuò versari Prædestinationis Dei

1571.

Of predestination and election.

Predestination to lyfe, is the euerlasting purpose of God, wherby (before the foundations of the world were layd) he hath constantly decreed by his councell secrete to vs, to deliuer from curse and damnation, those whom he hath chosen in Christe out of mankynde, and to bryng them by Christe to euerlastyng saluation, as vessels made to honour. Wherefore they which be indued with so excellent a benefite of God, be called accordyng to Gods purpose by his spirite workyng in due season: they through grace obey the callyng: they be iustified freely: they be made sonnes of God by adoption: they be made lyke the image of his onelye begotten sonne Jesus Christe: they walke religiously in good workes, and at length by Gods mercy, they attaine to euerlastyng felicitie.

As the godly consyderation of predestination, and our election in Christe, is full of sweete, pleasaunt, and vnspeakeable comfort to godly persons, and such as feele in themselues the working of the spirite of Christe, mortifying the workes of the fleshe, and their earthlye members, and drawing vp their mynde to hygh and heauenly thinges, aswell because it doth greatly establyshe and confirme their fayth of eternal saluation to be enioyed through Christ, as because it doth feruently kindle their loue towardes God: So, for curious and carnal persons, lacking the spirite of

sententiam, perniciosissimum est præcipitium, unde illos Diabolus protrudit, uel in desperationem, uel in æquè perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem.

Christe, to haue continually before their eyes the sentence of Gods predestination, is a most daungerous downefall, whereby the deuyll doth thrust them either into desperation, or into rechelesnesse of most vncleane liuing, no lesse perilous then desperation.

Deinde promissiones diuinas sic amplecti oportet, ut nobis in sacris literis generaliter propositæ sunt: et Dei voluntas in nostris actionibus ea sequenda est, quam in uerbo Dei habemus disertè reuelatam.

Furthermore, we must receaue Gods promises in such wyse, as they be generally set foorth to vs in holy scripture; and in our doynges, that wyl of God is to be folowed, which we haue expreslye declared vnto vs in the worde of God.

i. **Connection.** The Seventeenth Article naturally follows the last, which dealt in its concluding clauses with the doctrines of Indefectible Grace and Final Perseverance. In the original draft of 1553 it was preceded by an Article, treating of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. This was withdrawn in 1563[1].

ii. **Source.** The general wording of the Article is deemed to bear some resemblance to Luther's *Preface to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*[2]. The concluding paragraph, however, in which it is stated that "we must receive God's promises in such wise as they are generally set forth to us in holy Scripture," is thought to be more clearly traceable to the language of Melanchthon[3].

iii. **Object.** Its intention was to allay the angry and heated discussions respecting the doctrine of Predestination alike in the reforming bodies and in Scholastic and Anabaptist circles[4]. And while it commends in general terms

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 310.

[2] See Bishop Short's *History of the Church*, pp. 323, 324.

[3] Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 179 *n.*

[4] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 101. Fox and Strype alike record "that violent disputes on the subject of predestination took place between the Protestant prisoners, (particularly those in the King's Bench) during the persecution of Mary." For the precise opinions of the Moderate party as then

one view of Predestination, it is careful at the same time to guard against Fatalism, into which "curious and carnal persons" were in danger of being betrayed by taking a one-sided view on this mysterious subject.

iv. **The Doctrine of Predestination** has excited keen dispute at various epochs in the history of the Church. Men found themselves unable to reconcile the perfect power and knowledge of God with the freedom of the human will. The Grace of God, it was acknowledged, was universal. All souls were dear to Him, and He *willeth that all men should be saved, and come to a full knowledge of the truth*[1] (1 Tim. ii. 4). Yet it is manifest that all men do not attain to salvation. Some are placed in favourable, some in most unfavourable circumstances. Some have many privileges, some have none. How is this to be accounted for? If it is God's good pleasure to give men the kingdom, why do some succeed and some fail in attaining to everlasting salvation[2]? The question was diversely answered.

v. **The Answer of S. Augustine.** In the early ages of the Church the question did not excite much controversy. It was generally felt that man must be assisted by Divine Grace[3], if he is to do anything pleasing to God, and to attain to final salvation, and the idea that this Grace was not bestowed equally on all led to the further idea of an eternal decree regulating its bestowal. But the conception was as yet kept within moderate limits, and the Divine decree was not regarded as unconditional. Later

expressed, see the Appendix to Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 389—393.

[1] Ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν. Ἐπίγνωσις = *a clear knowledge* of the truth, a knowledge much insisted on in the Pastoral Epistles as contrasted with γνῶσις, *knowledge*, falsely so called. See 2 Tim. ii. 25; iii. 7; Titus i. 1.

[2] See Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 249.

[3] See Hermas, *Pastor, Sim.* viii. 6; Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, 141; Minucius Felix, c. 36.

on S. Augustine of Hippo, pondering over the earlier experience of a time when the mercy of God "pursued him through his wild youth and restless manhood until it conquered him 'under the fig-tree at Milan,'" and awed by the contemplation of the Love[1], which had rescued him from the path of sin, came to connect the Grace of God with an inscrutable and irresistible decree. This led to the conception of an Absolute Will, which out of the mass[2] of souls, all alike deserving perdition, selected a minority to become vessels of Divine Mercy (*vasa misericordiæ*), and abandoned the majority as vessels of Divine Wrath (*vasa iræ*) without regard, in either case, to foreseen moral character[3]. The views of this great Saint and eminent teacher met with a varied reception and drew forth considerable controversy, which was not settled till nearly a century after his death. Then Cæsarius, Archbishop of Arles, held a Council at Orange within his province in A.D. 529, which laid it down amongst other Articles, that according to the Catholic Faith, "all the baptized are capable, by Christ's aid and cooperation, if they choose to work faithfully, of fulfilling the conditions of eternal salvation." But the Council did not admit a predestination to evil. Those, it held, who do evil do it of their own free will[4].

vi. **The Answer of the Mediæval Divines.** The controversy then for a time slumbered, till it was revived by Gottschalk, a monk of Orbais in the diocese of Soissons[5].

[1] *Confess.* viii. 5, 28; Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises of S. Augustine*, Introd. pp. l, li.

[2] *Massa* was borrowed from the Latin Version (retained by Jerome) of Rom. ix. 21; see Aug. *De Pecc. Orig.* s. 36; *Ep.* 186, s. 19.

[3] In the case of souls elected to salvation Augustine held that Grace was irresistible and indefectible, *De Corr. et Grat.* s. 31, s. 14.

[4] See Bright's *Anti-Pelagian Treatises*, Introd., p. lxvi; Cheetham's *Six Centuries*, p. 326. "Gregory the Great transmitted to subsequent ages the milder form of the Augustinian doctrine in its relations to practical Christianity rather than to speculation." Hagenbach's *Hist. Doct.*, i. 433.

[5] See Robertson, *Hist. Ch.*, iii. 350 ff.; Hardwick, *Hist. Mid. Age*, pp. 162—164.

Going far beyond even his favourite author S. Augustine, he maintained the most rigorous opinions on the subject of Predestination and propounded a twofold system of decrees, which consigned the good and bad, elect and reprobate alike, quite irrespectively of their own conduct in the present life, to eternal happiness or misery. His opinions called forth the decisive opposition of the leading doctors of the age[1], and led to the publication by John Scotus Erigena of his famous treatise *De Prædestinatione* in A.D. 851. In the age of Scholasticism, the Augustinian doctrine of Predestination had the ascendency, but a departure from it was gradually prepared by Alexander of Hales, and more allowance was made for the operation of man's free-will[2]. S. Thomas Aquinas, however, and others put forth the doctrine without running into the extravagances, which were so injurious to true religion. They regarded Predestination, not as preceding the Divine prescience, but as resulting from it. They grounded election upon foreknowledge; they contemplated it, not as an arbitrary principle, separating one individual from another, under the influence of a blind chance, or an irrational caprice, but as the orderly arrangement of One, who *willeth that all men should be saved*, and has regulated His predetermination by the quality of the soil through which His Grace passes[3]. Moreover they held an election to Grace distinct from an election to Glory, and affirmed that "predestination to eternal happiness solely depends on final perseverance in well doing[4]."

[1] Especially Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, and Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, who flung Gottschalk into prison, where he died A.D. 868. Hardwick, *Hist. Mid. Age*, p. 162, and p. 165 *n.*

[2] Neander, *Hist. of Christian Doct.*, ii. p. 568.

[3] "Dicendum quod electio divina non præexigit diversitatem gratiæ, quia hoc electionem consequitur; sed *præexigit diversitatem naturæ* in divina cognitione, et facit diversitatem *gratiæ*, sicut *dispositio* diversitatem *naturæ facit*." S. Thom. Aquin. *Sum.* i. 41, Quæst. i. Art. 2.

[4] Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 162. "Sic igitur et *ordo prædesti-*

vii. **The Answer of Calvin.** At the period of the Reformation, the School of Calvin, reviving the extreme forms of the Augustinian doctrine, held that there could be no limitation to the power of God. Seeing, then, that all men are not saved, it could not be the purpose of God that all men should be saved[1]. They held like Gottschalk that He imparts His renewing Grace to such only as He chooses in His eternal counsel and purpose to save. All others, for whom this Grace is not designed, are appointed to eternal misery, and this is utterly irrespective of anything, good or bad, in them[2]. This election proceeds entirely from the absolute, unconditional, and irresistible determination of the Divine Will[3].

viii. **The Answer of Arminius.** Another school, that of Arminius[4], held that God willed the salvation of all men, and proffered His renewing Grace to all men without distinction. But while He left men's will free, He vouchsafed His final salvation as the reward of those good deeds,

nationis est certus, et *tamen libertas arbitrii non tollitur*, ex qua *contingenter* provenit prædestinationis effectus." S. Thom. Aquin. *Sum.* i. 24, Art. 3.

[1] Born at Noyon, in Picardy, A.D. 1509, Calvin, on being forced to quit France, settled at Geneva, and there his system was widely disseminated, and gained a vast number of adherents. His "Institutes" were published in 1536. The great discussion, however, respecting Predestination at Geneva, and the publication of Calvin's book *De Prædestinatione* did not take place till 1552, the very year in which the Articles were put forth. Calvin died A.D. 1564.

[2] "Non pari conditione creantur omnes; sed aliis vita æterna, aliis damnatio æterna præordinatur." Calvin, *Instit.* iii. 21.

[3] In Calvin's own time Melanchthon attacked the arbitrariness of this theory of election, saying, "Talis electio sine causis videtur tyrannica." Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 414; Aubrey Moore's *Reformation*, p. 516.

[4] James Harmensen was a native of Holland, and was born at Oudewater in A.D. 1560. After studying at the University of Leyden he went to Geneva, and under the teaching of Beza embraced the doctrine of Predestination in its most rigid form. Returning to Amsterdam in 1588, and being appointed pastor of the Reformed congregation, he was led to a more careful examination of the subject, and considerably modified his views. In 1604 he was made professor in the University of Leyden, and gained many converts to his opinions, which led to bitter controversy between him and his followers and their Calvinistic opponents. He died in 1609.

which He foresaw that men would do. Thus while the Arminian system softened the more rigid features of Calvinism, it regarded the number of the elect as dependent on God's foreknowledge of a right use of gifts imparted[1].

ix. **The Teaching of the Primitive Fathers.** Going back to the earliest times of the Church we find that the Primitive Fathers, taking a practical view of the subject, identify the elect with the baptized[2], and hold that Predestination and Election are to Baptismal privileges, while the question whether a person is elected to life eternal and final glory can be known only to God Himself. They hold that as the Jews of old were all the chosen people of God, so now every baptized member of the Christian Church is one of God's elect. Thus:—

(α) Clement of Rome begins his Epistle to the Corinthians, "The Church of God which sojourneth in Rome to the Church of God which sojourneth in Corinth, to them which are called and sanctified by the will of God through our Lord Jesus Christ[3];"

(β) Again Ignatius writes to the Church in Tralles as "elect and worthy of God, having peace in flesh and spirit through the Passion of Jesus Christ[4];"

[1] Similarly Prudentius, Bishop of Troyes, and Ratramnus, of Corbey, in the ninth century, while they would not commit themselves to the extreme position of Gottschalk affirmed that the Predestination of the wicked is not absolute, but is conditioned by Divine foreknowledge of all sin that would result from the voluntary act of Adam. Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 163.

[2] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 393.

[3] Clem. Rom. *Ep.* 1 *ad Cor.* cap. i. He also writes "Let us, therefore, approach Him in holiness of soul...loving our gentle and compassionate Father, Who made us an elect portion unto Himself," ἀγαπῶντες τὸν ἐπιεικῆ καὶ εὔσπλαγχνον πατέρα ἡμῶν ὃς ἐκλογῆς μέρος ἡμᾶς ἐποίησεν ἑαυτῷ. Ibid. cap. 29.

[4] Ἐκλεκτῇ καὶ ἀξιοθέῳ, εἰρηνευούσῃ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ πνεύματι. Ignat. *ad Trall.* cap. i., comp. Ignat. *ad Ephes.*, cap. i.

(γ) So also Justin Martyr speaking of the Christian Church in opposition to the Jewish, says, "We are by no means a despicable people, nor a barbarous nation, like the Phrygians and the Carians, but God hath elected us, and hath manifested Himself to those who asked not for Him[1];"

(δ) So also Irenæus writes, "the same God, who formerly elected the patriarchs, hath now elected us[2];"

(ε) Similarly Clement of Alexandria in the third century says, "I call the Church the general assembly of the elect[3]," and he holds the Church to be an Assembly "which collects together by the will of God those already ordained, whom God hath predestinated[4]."

These quotations sufficiently show that the Primitive Fathers taking a practical view of the subject identified the elect with the baptized, and regarded the election to privilege as the one matter of practical concern.

x. **The Analogy of the Jewish Church** confirms this view. The whole Jewish nation were once the object of God's election. But for what purpose were they elected? Was it to an unfailing and infallible possession even of the Promised Land? Nay, of those who were delivered from Egyptian bondage, all but two perished before they ever reached it, and their carcases lay bleaching in the desert.

[1] Οὐκ...ἐσμὲν...βάρβαρον φῦλον, οὐδὲ ὁποῖα Καρῶν ἢ Φρυγῶν ἔθνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐμφανὴς ἐγενήθη τοῖς μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτόν. Just. Mart. *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 119.

[2] Irenæus, *Adv. Hær.* iv. 70, "Quoniam et patriarchas qui elegit et nos, idem est Verbum Dei."

[3] Τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ. Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* vii.

[4] Μονὴν εἶναί φαμεν τὴν ἀρχαίαν καὶ καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν...δι' ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου συνάγουσαν τοὺς ἤδη κατατεταγμένους, οὕς προώρισεν ὁ Θεός. *Stromat.* vii.

They were elected to great and glorious privileges. They were *chosen to be a special people unto the Lord Himself, above all peoples that were upon the face of the earth* (Deut. vii. 6)[1]. He could say to them by the mouth of Isaiah, *Thou, Israel, My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham My friend; thou whom I have taken hold of from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the corners thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art My servant, I have chosen thee and not cast thee away* (Isai. xli. 8, 9). But why had God elected them? They were called to fulfil a high and solemn purpose in the Divine counsels, to preserve the doctrine of the Unity of God, to be the guardians of His Law, to keep alive the hope of the Messiah, and to set the example of a pattern people living in righteousness and true holiness. If there were any further election, as far as the Old Testament is concerned, it was one of the secret things hidden under the shadow of God's throne.

xi. **Election in the New Testament.** The Apostles apply to the members of the Christian Church precisely the same language as is used by Moses and the prophets respecting the Jewish nation. S. Paul scarcely begins any Epistle without addressing not a few but all the members of the Church to which he is writing, as "holy," or "called," or "elect." *Knowing, brethren beloved of God, your election*, he writes to the Thessalonians[2]. *To all that are in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints: Grace to you and peace*[3], he writes to the Romans (Rom. i. 7). He addresses, without particularising any special persons *the saints* at Corinth, at Ephesus, at Philippi, at Colossæ[4]. Similarly S. Peter calls the members of the Church of the

[1] Compare Deut. xxvi. 18, 19.

[2] 1 Thess. i. 4, Εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν.

[3] Rom. i. 7, Πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἀγαπητοῖς Θεοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις.

[4] Comp. 1 Cor. i. 19; Eph. i. 1; Phil. i. 1; Col. i. 2.

Dispersion, *elect...according to the foreknowledge of God the Father:...a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession*[1] (1 Pet. i. 1, 2, ii. 9). Thus just as the prophets addressed the Jews so the Apostles address the members of the different Churches to whom they wrote. They speak of them as the chosen people of God; they impress upon them the privileges and blessings of their election; they urge upon them the realisation of their true position as members of Christ, and children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. But they do not speak of them or to them as elected to an infallible salvation, to an absolutely certain crown. They speak of them as having a conflict to maintain, and a race to run; they exhort them to *quench not the Spirit* Who is aiding them; to *grieve Him not* (1 Thess. v. 19) lest He wing His everlasting flight; they warn them to be steadfast and to *work out their own salvation with fear and trembling* (Phil. ii. 12); they urge them *to be sober unto prayer*[2] (1 Pet. iv. 7).

xii. **The Teaching of the Article.** In keeping with this calm and balanced language, the Article preserves a judicious moderation. It neither attempts to solve the

[1] Λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν = literally *a people for a purchasing*, or *acquisition* (*peculium*), and specially for the purchase effected by the Precious Blood of Christ. "The peculiar people, or people for the purchase is the Universal Church, which God has purchased for Himself by the precious Blood of His dear Son." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.*

[2] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 427. "According to the general usage of the New Testament, all who are admitted into the Church are the elect. The term (except in a few passages of the Gospels, where the context makes its meaning clear) does not express those who are finally selected to partake of the joys of heaven. Before that blessing can be theirs, they must, with faithful endeavour 'make their calling and election sure' (2 Pet. i. 10). The thing to which they have been elected, 'according to the foreknowledge of God,' is described by S. Peter as 'obedience and sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ' (1 Pet. i. 2): that is to say, they are Christians. This is already theirs; and if it be rightly used, it is a pledge and an earnest of eternal salvation." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 347, 348, ed. 1889.

problem of reconciling the foreknowledge of God with the free will of man, nor does it touch on the doctrine of reprobation, nor does it pronounce judgment on those, who have not been brought within the scope of the Gospel message.

(i) Keeping close to the words of Holy Scripture, and especially to the teaching of S. Paul, it simply states the fact of Predestination in the Divine Mind, whereby God *chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before Him in love: having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself, according to the good pleasure of His will* (Eph. i. 4, 5)[1];

(ii) Similarly, in strict keeping with the Epistle to the Romans, it affirms that *whom God foreknew*[2], *He also foreordained*[3] *to be conformed*

[1] One of the best comments on this passage is supplied by the introductory address of S. Ignatius in his Epistle to this same Church of Ephesus: "Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, unto her which hath been blessed in greatness through the plenitude of God the Father; which hath been foreordained before the ages to be for ever unto abiding and unchangeable glory, united and elect in a true passion (ἡνωμένη καὶ ἐκλελεγμένη ἐν πάθει ἀληθινῷ), by the will of the Father and of Jesus Christ our God; even unto the Church which is in Ephesus [in Asia], worthy of all felicitation: abundant greeting in Christ Jesus and in blameless joy." Ignat. *ad Eph.* i. It is evident that this early Father here applies the words *Election* and *Predestination*—and that he supposed S. Paul to apply them—to the *whole visible Church of God* at Ephesus; to all those who were joined in the body of Christ by the Apostolic symbol of "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism" (Eph. iv. 5). See Bp C. Wordsworth *Comm. in loc.*

[2] Προέγνω. The idea that God *knows beforehand*, that He possesses *præscientia, prescience*, is inseparable from our conception of Him as the "Everlasting Now." But the fact that He foreknows, that His mind rests beforehand upon a person with approval (Exod. xxxiii. 12, LXX., and Psalm i. 6), does not interfere with man's free agency. That *God* foreknows what we shall do no more destroys our free agency than *our* foreknowing, with accuracy proportionate to the reliability of our characters, how we shall act in any given case. Comp. Mill, *Logic*, ii. p. 422, ed. 1879.

[3] Προώρισε. For the word comp. Acts iv. 28, Ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου προώρισε γενέσθαι; 1 Cor. ii. 7, Θεοῦ σοφίαν...ἣν προώρισεν ὁ Θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων. God, who from all eternity foresees, also foreordains all His works. But again

to the image of His Son that He might be the firstborn among many brethren: and whom He foreordained, them He also called: and whom He called[1], *them He also justified: and whom He justified, them He also glorified* (Rom. viii. 29, 30);

(iii) It then goes on to state, still in Biblical language, how the Grace of God leads those whom He calls by His Spirit[2], to obey His calling; how He justifies them freely[3], and adopts them as His sons; how He makes them to do good works, and at length leads them to everlasting felicity.

(iv) After laying down these careful statements, the Article guards men against any abuse of the doctrine: for it says that

(α) While on the one hand the doctrine tends to comfort[4] "godly persons, and such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of

this foreordaining does not interfere with man's free will.

[1] Called, ἐκάλεσε = *summoned, invited to an actual participation* in the blessings of the Gospel. This as a thing *done already* on God's part, and the consequent assurance to us that He will never fail to continue to do all that is requisite on His side for the salvation of every believer, is strongly expressed by S. Paul's use of the *past* tenses, He foreknew, He foreordained, He justified, He glorified. See Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.*

[2] "*Spiritu ejus opportuno tempore operante;* by his Spirit operating, not irresistibly at pleasure, without regard to time and circumstances, but conformably with the established constitution of human nature, at a seasonable period, when the mind is indisposed to resistance, or, as in infancy, incapable of it." Abp Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 171.

[3] Freely, *gratis*, i.e. "without any expiation or satisfaction for sin on their part, Christ himself being the meritorious cause of it." Ibid. p. 173.

[4] "When we follow the teaching of S. Peter and S. Paul, and recognise that all the baptized are elect and predestinate, then, although the final result is not yet assured to us, we receive unspeakable comfort and hope. The weakest Christian may believe that he is no intruder within the sacred precincts, brought in by his own presumption or the mistaken kindness of friends. He is where God Himself has placed him, and had eternally determined to place Him." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 351, ed. 1889.

Christ," while it establishes and confirms "their faith of eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Christ[1]," "and fervently kindles their love towards God;"

(β) So on the other it tempts "curious[2] and carnal persons, lacking the Spirit of Christ," to "a most dangerous downfall[3], whereby the Devil doth thrust them either into desperation, or into wretchlessness[4] of most unclean living[5], no less perilous than desperation."

(v) The Article concludes with two important Canons of interpretation of Holy Scripture in reference to this mysterious subject:

(α) "We must receive God's promises in such

[1] Fidem nostram de æterna salute consequenda per Christum, i.e. "*our* confidence in Christian salvation generally, and not theirs particularly, a change of the pronoun adopted in the Latin not without design." Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 174 sq.

[2] Curious. *Curiosus* in Latin denotes one who is over-curious, inquisitive. Hence its application to those who dealt with magical arts. Here it means those who continually pry into mysteries, which must ever remain mysteries, who "begyn fyrst from on highe, to seeke the bottomles secretes of Gods predestinacyon, whether they be predestinat or not." Gardiner quoted by Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 405, ed. 1890.

[3] Præcipitium in Classical Latin denotes sometimes (1) a steep place, the actual precipice, from which a man falls, "in præcipitium propellere," Suet. *Aug.* lxxix., sometimes (2) the act of falling, "dum aliorum præcipitium vident," Lact. ii. 3.

[4] Rechelesnesse. *Rechielesnese*, 1553, the modern *recklessness*. From reck = *to regard*. M.S. *rekken*, A.-S. *récan*, to care. Formed from a substantive with base *roc*, care, which exists in the cognate M.H.G. *ruoch*, whence the M.H.G. *ruochen*. Der. *reck-less*, A.-S. *réce-leás*; Dutch *roekeloos*, reckless. Skeat's *Etym. Dictionary*.

[5] This is the English rendering of the Latin "perniciosam impurissimæ vitæ securitatem." Securitas (sine, cura) denotes (i) *freedom from care*, *composure* = the Greek ἀπραξία. Comp. Cic. *de Off.* i. xx. 69, "Vacandum est omni animi perturbatione, ut tranquillitas animi et *securitas* assit, quæ affert quum constantiam tum etiam dignitatem"; (ii) complete *unconcern*, and *indifference*, *recklessness*. Comp. Quintil. iv. 1. 55, "odit judex litigantis *securitatem*," and Tac. *Hist.* iii. 83. For the sentiment expressed in the clause compare the words of Luther *Postill. Domest.* p. 58, "E contra ii, qui sentiunt Dei voluntatem non esse, ut *omnes* salventur, *aut in desperationem aut in securissimam impietatem dissolvantur*."

wise as they be generally[1]," or universally, "set forth in holy Scripture;"

(β) "In our doings that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God."

xiii. **The Universality of Redemption.** In opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine of reprobation[2], which they tacitly ignore, the Articles hold with great clearness and certainty the universality of redemption through Christ. They lay it down in Article ii. that Christ "truly suffered... to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for *all* actual sins of men;" in Article vii. that "everlasting life is offered to *Mankind* by Christ[3];" in Article xv. that Christ "came to be the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins *of the world*[4]"; in Article xxxi. that the offering of Christ is "that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for *all the sins of the whole world*, both original and actual[5]." Similarly in the Baptismal Service it is asserted that the goodwill of our heavenly Father flows forth towards all, who are brought to His holy Baptism, that He favourably receives them, and embraces them with the arms of His mercy, gives unto them the blessing of eternal

[1] "Generaliter propositæ." Generaliter, from genus, denotes "for the race," "universally." Comp. Quintil. v. 10, 42 sq., "tempus *generaliter* et specialiter accipitur." Hence the expressions in the Prayer-Book "General Confession," "General Thanksgiving," "generally necessary to salvation." Comp. also Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lv. 1, "God in Christ is *generally* the medicine, which doth cure the world."

[2] From the verb δέχομαι, *I accept*, comes (i) the adjective δόκιμος, *acceptable, approvable* (1 Cor. xi. 19; 2 Cor. x. 18; Rom. xiv. 18), and (ii) its opposite, ἀδόκιμος, *unacceptable, unapprovable, rejected on trial* (1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Heb. vi. 8). The reprobate are those, who after trial are found to be unworthy of the privileges and promises of the Gospel, and therefore are rejected.

[3] "Æterna vita *humano generi* est proposita."

[4] "*Mundi* peccata."

[5] "Pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus, quam actualibus."

life, and makes them partakers of His everlasting kingdom[1]. Moreover the baptized are said to be "received into the number of the children of God, and made heirs of everlasting life[2]," and the child is taught in the Church Catechism to say that in Baptism it was made "*a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.*" Again in answer to the question respecting the Articles of its Belief, it is instructed to answer, "I learn to believe...in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth *me, and all the elect people of God.*"

xiv. **The Canons of Interpretation** which close the Article are designed to guard men against erroneous views on the subject of personal and individual election. They state that

(α) "We must receive God's promises in such wise, as they be generally[3] set forth to us in holy Scripture." This clause was preceded in 1553 by the words, "although the Decrees of predestination are unknown unto us[4]." The secret

[1] See the Office of Public and Private Baptism. In the prayer after Public Baptism we say respecting every child, "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it *hath pleased thee to regenerate* this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own Child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy Church."

[2] In the Office of Private Baptism. Every baptized Christian has been chosen out of the world to be placed in the Church, in order that he may be brought by Christ to everlasting salvation, as a vessel made to honour. He may forfeit the blessing afterwards, but it has been freely bestowed upon him. "Salvation, if attained, will be wholly due to the grace of God, which first chooses the elect soul to the blessings of the Baptismal covenant, and afterwards endues it with power to live the life of faith." Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 433.

[3] On the word "generally," see above, p. 225, and compare the words of Latimer, "The promises of Christ our Saviour are *general*; they pertain to all mankind. He made a general proclamation, saying, 'Whosoever believeth in Me hath everlasting life!'... Also consider what Christ saith with His own mouth; 'Come to Me, *all* ye that labour, and are laden, and I will ease you.' Mark here He saith, 'Come *all* ye'; wherefore then should any man despair to shut himself from these promises of Christ, which be *general*, and pertain to the whole world?" *Serm.*, p. 182, Ed. 1584.

[4] "Licet prædestinationis decreta sunt nobis ignota," to which one MS.

decrees of God respecting the ultimate destiny of individuals are and must be hidden from us[1]. But His *promises* are to be received[2] as they apply to *all* men, not to particular persons[3]. Expressions, which, according to their original intention, apply to all men generally, are not to be narrowed down to certain favourites previously ordained to bliss, but are to be regarded as applicable to all who have been baptized into the Church. And again men are not to indulge every evil propensity of their nature, under pretence of being overruled by a secret will of Heaven which they can neither promote nor resist[4];

(β) "In our doings, that Will of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared to us in the Word of God." His revealed will is *that all men shall be saved, and come unto a full knowledge of the truth* (1 Tim. ii. 4); that *whosoever believeth on the Son of God should not perish, but have everlasting life* (John iii. 16);

adds "quantum homines de hominibus judicare possunt."

[1] Comp. Melanchthon, *Opera* iv. pp. 498, 499, "Et si alia subtiliter de electione disputari fortasse possunt, tamen prodest piis tenere, quod *promissio sit universalis*. Nec debemus *de voluntate Dei aliter judicare, quam juxta verbum revelatum*...Nos igitur simpliciter interpretamur hanc sententiam *universaliter*, 'Deus vult omnes homines salvos fieri,' scilicet, *quod* ad ipsius voluntatem attinet."

[2] Archbishop Laurence paraphrases the clause in the Article thus: "'We must receive' (*embrace, amplecti*) 'the promises of God, in such wise as they are generally set forth to us in holy Scripture,' or as they are proposed to us *all* in Scripture, because *all, as Christians, are predestined to salvation*." *Bampton Lectures*, Appendix, p. 375.

[3] "The Christian sees, represented in the concrete fact of his Baptism, the eternal and unchangeable attitude of God towards him. His own personality, now passing through the vicissitudes of an earthly discipline, is linked to the stability of the life of God." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 332 sq., ed. 1888; comp. Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 254.

[4] See Laurence, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 128.

that *the Gospel should be preached to every creature* (Mk. xvi. 15). This is His Will as "expressly declared to us." This we have to follow. And instead of regarding man's ultimate destiny as arbitrarily fixed by an unalterable decree, we are to extend the privileges, of which we have been made partakers, to as many as we can reach. For the elect people of God in this Dispensation, as well as in that which preceded it, are not elected only for their own advantage, but for the advantage of all the members of the human family[1].

[1] "The Gospel is to be regarded as a *trust*, deposited with us in behalf of others, in behalf of mankind, as well as for our own improvement." Bishop Butler's Sermon before the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, 1738–9. "The Church was intended as, and ever has been, the instrument by which God makes known His holy Will and marvellous love *to all the people on the face of the earth*. If there is one thing taught in the history of the Church more than another, it is that the Lord intends her to preach the Gospel *to the whole of mankind*. He has provided the Church for this work, and it is plain that He will not provide any other means by which it can be done." Address by the Bishop of London to the Clergy at Sion College, Jan. 23, 1893.

ARTICLE XVIII.

1563.

Tantum in nomine Christi speranda est æterna salus.

Svnt illi anathematizandi qui dicere audent, vnumquemque in Lege aut secta quam profitetur, esse seruandum, modo iuxta illam et lumen naturæ accurate vixerit: cùm sacræ literæ tantum Iesu Christi nomen prædicent, in quo saluos fieri homines oporteat.

1571.

Of obtaynyng eternall saluation, only by the name of Christe.

They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that euery man shal be saued by the lawe or sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his lyfe accordyng to that lawe, and the light of nature. For holy scripture doth set out vnto vs onely the name of Jesus Christe, whereby men must be saued.

i. **Connection.** But if all deliverance, all everlasting salvation, is to be referred to the secret counsel of God as wrought out by the all-perfect sacrifice of His Blessed Son, can they be right, who hold that as long as men are sincere "in following out their own systems, their deliberate rejection of the Saviour of the world will prove no obstacle to their salvation[1]?" It is with this theory of the rationalistic school of Anabaptists that the Eighteenth Article is concerned.

ii. **Title.** The Latin title of this Article, while it was the same in 1553 and 1563, as given above, became in 1571, "De speranda æterna Salute tantum in Nomine Christi."

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 102, ed. 1859. Compare *Reformatio Legum*, "de Hæresibus," c. 11. "Horribilis est et immanis illorum audacia, qui contendunt in omni religione vel secta, quam homines professi fuerint, salutem illis esse sperandam, si tantum ad innocentiam et integritatem vitæ pro viribus enitantur juxta lumen, quod illis prælucet a natura infusum."

The original English, however, gave a literal translation of the Latin, "We must trust to obtain eternal Salvation only by the name of Christ[1]."

iii. **Language.** The opening of the Article presents a slight difficulty by the occurrence of the word "also." "They also are to be had accursed[2]." The explanation seems to be that reference is here made to the closing words of the Sixteenth Article, "And therefore they are to be condemned." The present Article takes up the thread of the language there used, as though there was no break in the continuity of the two Articles.

iv. **The Object** of the Article is to protest against the lax notion that it does not much matter what men believe, so long as their morals are right[3], and that nothing in religion is so certain, that it need be insisted on as essential to salvation[4]. For if this were so, it is obvious that the whole of Christ's work and His life and death could be deprived of all meaning and all purpose[5].

v. **Analysis.** The Article consists of two parts:—

(i) A proposition which is condemned:

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* pp. 298, 299 *n.* ed. 1859.

[2] "Sunt et illi anathematizandi," 1553. The "et" is retained in two MSS. of the Latin draft of 1563. In 1553 the English Version ran, "They also are to be had accursed, and abhorred." The latter word was dropped in 1563. By being "accursed" is meant that they are to be debarred from the privileges of the Church or excommunicated so long as they persist in their error.

[3] The notion is based upon the fallacy that belief is an act or habit of the intellect merely, the intellect *in vacuo*. But, to begin with, there is no such thing as the intellect *in vacuo*, and, next, belief is essentially moral, an act or habit of the moral will. Since will is "the expression of the man as he is," belief is very reasonably to be defined in the same terms. See Caird, *Evolution of Religion*, i. p. 30; Green, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, p. 158.

[4] It is the spirit that breathes in the well-known lines of Pope:

"For creeds and forms let senseless bigots fight,
He can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."

[5] "It is the one spiritual sin, which the Church of England anathematizes, because it finds its logical basis in the abnegation of all objective truth whatsoever." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 259.

That every man may owe his eternal salvation to "the Law or Sect[1] which he professeth;"

(ii) The reason of this condemnation:

"For holy Scripture doth set out[2] unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved."

vi. **The Scripture Argument** in favour of the position taken up in the Article may be arranged under the heads of (*a*) *Indirect*, and (*b*) *Direct* proofs :—

(*a*) *Indirect Proofs:*

The best Law ever given to man was the Law of Moses, and if any people could have owed their salvation to the Law which they professed it was the Jews[3]. But the possession even of this perfect Law did not avail to this end, and S. Paul distinctly affirms that *by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified in God's sight* (Rom. iii. 20), and that *Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at*[4] *that law* (Rom. ix. 31). Moreover the

[1] Secta, from seco=*to cut*, denotes (i) *A trodden* or *beaten path;* (ii) *a way or mode of conduct* or *procedure;* (iii) *a philosophical school* or *sect.* Comp. Quintil. v. 7, 35, "Inter Stoicos et Epicuri *sectam* secutos pugna perpetua est"; Tac. *Hist.* iv. 40, "Demetrio Cynicam *sectam* professo."

[2] Comp. the Latin, "Cum sacræ literæ tantum Jesu Christi nomen prædicent." Prædĭcare, to be carefully distinguished from prædĭcere, = (i) *to cry in public, to proclaim;* Plaut. *Bacch.* iv. 7. 17, "Præco *prædicat;*" Cic. 2 *Verr.* iii. 16, 40, "Si palam præco *prædicasset;*" (ii) *to make known*, or *publicly declare, state*, or *affirm.* Comp. Ter. *Andr.* iii. 1. 7, "Si quidem hæc vera prædicat;" Cæsar, *Bell. Gall.* iv. 34, "Barbari paucitatem nostrorum militum suis prædicaverunt." For "set out"=*to proclaim* or *publish*, comp. Cooper's *Thesaurus* (1565), "Edo, to utter or put forth: to publish or sette abroade"; "to *sette out* in writing"; Lord Bacon, "I will use no other authority than that excellent proclamation *set out* by the king in the first year of his reign and annexed before the Book of Common Prayer;" Winthrop, *Hist. New England*, i. 264, "The other Minister also *set out* an answer to his sermon, confuting the same by many strong arguments."

[3] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 443.

[4] Ἰσραὴλ δὲ διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης

strictest obedience to the Law of Conscience, though it might conceivably entitle a man to temporal reward, could not constitute any claim whatever to everlasting life. This is ever declared in Scripture to be not a matter of right, but the *free gift* of God to men, and this free gift He has willed should stand connected in the way of cause and effect not with the light of nature, but with the Divine Economy of Grace[1].

(*b*) *Direct Proofs:*

(i) Our Lord says

(α) *He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life*[2]*; but he that obeyeth not*[3] *the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on Him* (John iii. 36);

(β) *I am*[4] *the way*[5]*, and the truth, and the*

εἰς νόμον οὐκ ἔφθασε Rom. ix. 31. Israel following after the law of righteousness, did not reach the standard of the Law, which has only been attained by the perfect obedience of Christ. Ἔφθασε. From the sense of *anticipating* with τίνα (comp. 1 Thess. iv. 15) comes that of *reaching by anticipation of others, reaching unmolested, arriving at*, whether (1) absolutely, as Ezra iii. 1, 2, LXX.; Dan. vii. 22, LXX., or (2) as here, with εἰς, as in Dan. iv. 21, LXX.; vi. 24, LXX.; Phil. iii. 16, or (3) with ἐπί, as in Matt. xii. 28; 1 Thess. ii. 16.

[1] *The wages of sin is death* writes S. Paul, *but the free gift* (χάρισμα) *of God is eternal life in Jesus Christ our Lord.* Τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Rom. vi. 23. Comp. Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 262.

[2] "The absolute supremacy of the Christian revelation as compared with all that went before is seen in its final issues of life, and incapacity for life." Westcott *in loc.*

[3] Ὁ ἀπειθῶν = *he that disobeyeth.* "Disbelief is regarded in its activity." Comp. Rom. ii. 8; xi. 30, 31; 1 Pet. iv. 17. "Nothing is said of those who have no opportunity of coming to the true knowledge of Christ." *Ibid.*

[4] He says not "I reveal," or "I open," or "I make," but "*I* am." "The pronoun is emphatic, and at once turns the thought of the Apostles from a method to a Person." Westcott *in loc.* "Ego sum via, veritas, et vita. Sine via non itur, sine veritate non cognoscitur, sine vita non vivitur. Ego sum via quam sequi debes: veritas, cui credere debes: vita, quam sperare debes." Thomas à Kempis, *De Imit.* iii. 56. For the application of the expression "the Way," to the Christian Faith, comp. Acts xix. 23; xxii. 4; xxiv. 14, 22.

[5] "The Way involves the double Office of Christ as doing for us what we cannot do, and as the power in

life[1]*; no one cometh unto the Father but by me* (John xiv. 6);

(γ) *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned*[2] (Mark xvi. 16);

(ii) Again, S. Peter says

In none other is there salvation; for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved (Acts iv. 12);

(iii) Similarly S. Paul writes

(α) *Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ* (1 Cor. iii. 11);

(β) *There is one God, one mediator also between God and man, Himself man, Christ Jesus, Who gave Himself a ransom for all* (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6);

(iv) And also S. John writes

The witness is this, that God gave[3] *unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life*[4]*; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life* (1 John v. 11, 12).

which we do all things, and it makes our work, with all its imperfections, coextensive with His." Prof. Hort's *Hulsean Lectures*, p. 201.

[1] "*I am the Life.* This is the crowning revelation of Himself which our Lord makes to the soul of man. He does not merely show us a road or reveal a truth; He offers the inward power without which we cannot to any purpose follow the one or grasp the other." Liddon's *Christmastide Sermons*, p. 34.

[2] See R.V. marginal note on Mark xvi. 9—20.

[3] Ἔδωκεν, "*gave eternal life*, not *hath given*.... The reference is to the historic facts by which this life was communicated to humanity. That which before Christ's coming was a great hope, by His coming was realised and given." Westcott *in loc.*

[4] Ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν = *hath the life*, which God has given. See Joh. v. 26; x. 10; xx. 31. Comp. Westcott *in loc.*

vii. **Conclusion.** These explicit statements bear out the words of the Article. Without denying that the power of our Lord's Incarnation and Passion may extend to many who have not heard His Name, it asserts that our access to God is through Christ, and conversely that there is no access to God save through Him[1]. It simply affirms that apart from God's way of salvation, there is no possibility of salvation at all[2]. On the ultimate condition of many of the heathen world it pronounces no opinion. It simply declares that, if a man is saved at all, his salvation must be due not to his holding the doctrines of any particular school or the tenets of any special sect, but to the One Redeemer of the Universe, Who was and is alone for every child of man at once *the Way, and the Truth, and the Life.* What the Article denies is this, that a man's law or sect will *of itself* be sufficient for his salvation[3].

[1] The Article is often quoted as harsh, just because it is not rightly understood. It is supposed not only to exclude heathen from salvation, but also sceptics, who are honest in their convictions and blameless in their lives. What the Article does protest against is the mere easy-going notion, that a man's creed cannot be wrong if his life is in the right.

[2] Andreas de Perusio, a Franciscan, speaking of the prospects of the Church in the dominions of the Great Khans, and especially in China, says, "In illo vasto imperio sunt gentes de omni natione quæ sub cælo est, et de omni secta, et conceditur omnibus et singulis vivere secundum sectam suam. *Est enim hæc opinio apud eos, seu potius error, quod unusquisque in sua secta salvatur.*" Hardwick, *Articles*, p. 386, ed. 1859.

[3] It would have been a serious difficulty if the Article had said that a man may not be saved *in* his sect; what it does deny is that a man "shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law and the light of Nature." The Latin ("*in* Lege aut secta") of 1563 may fairly be interpreted by the English of 1571. "In Acts iv. 12 *ἐν ᾧ*, translated in the Latin Article *in quo*, is rendered in the English *whereby*. The meaning is obviously admissible that a man *may* be saved in an imperfect religion by God's mercy and Christ's merits, though not in virtue of his being a faithful member of that sect." Dr Jelf *On the Articles*, p. 230. F. D. Maurice, *Sermon on the Articles*, p. 48.

GROUP IV.

ARTICLES XIX.—XXXIV.

The Articles in this group deal with men as Members of the Church.

(α) They define the characteristic marks of the visible Church, and while acknowledging the infallibility of the Church as a whole, they deny the infallibility of any particular branch of it (Art. xix.);

(β) They next deal with (i) the authority of the Church and the limitations thereto (Art. xx.); with (ii) general Councils as the voice of the Church (Art. xxi.); and with (iii) certain doctrines sanctioned by Councils claiming to be general (Art. xxii.);

(γ) They then pass on to treat (i) of the Ministers of the Church, their call and mission (Art. xxiii.), and the language proper to their ministrations (Art. xxiv.); (ii) of the Sacraments of the Church, first generally (Arts. xxv. and xxvi.), and then specially, of Holy Baptism (Art. xxvii.), and of the Holy Eucharist (Arts. xxviii. and xxix.), which is to be administered to the laity in Both Kinds (Art. xxx.);

(δ) They next deal (i) with the relation of the Sacraments to the one sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross (Art. xxxi.); (ii) with the question of clerical celibacy (Art. xxxii.), with the power of excommunication (Art. xxxiii.), and with the right of particular Churches to accept, in things indifferent, local usages (Art. xxxiv.).

Article XIX.

1563.	1571.
De Ecclesia.	*Of the Church.*
Ecclesia Christi uisibilis est cœtus fidelium, in quo uerbum Dei purum prædicatur, et sacramenta, quoad ea quæ necessario exiguntur, iuxta Christi institutum rectè administrantur. Sicut errauit ecclesia Hierosolymitana, Alexandrina et Antiochena: ita et errauit Ecclesia Romana, non solùm quoad agenda et cæremoniarum ritus, uerum in hijs etiam quæ credenda sunt.	The visible Church of Christe, is a congregation of faythfull men, in the which the pure worde of God is preached, and the Sacramentes be duely ministred, accordyng to Christes ordinaunce in all those thynges that of necessitie are requisite to the same. As the Church of Hierusalem, Alexandria, and Antioche haue erred: so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their liuing and maner of ceremonies, but also in matters of fayth.

i. **Connection.** The transition from the Third to the Fourth Group of the Articles is a natural one. After declaring that our everlasting salvation is to be referred solely to the merciful Grace of God, and that He has revealed only One Person, in Whom this salvation is to be attained, we are led on to think of the Church, into which it is God's will that men should be brought, and which He has appointed "as the earthly home of those who embrace the Gospel and would be saved."

ii. **Title.** The Title of Article xix. has remained the same since the first draft in 1553. In that draft it was preceded by another, the old xixth, the title of which was, "All men are bound to keep the moral commandments of

the Law[1]." The greater part of this Article has been incorporated with the present Seventh Article.

iii. **The Object** of the Article is a twofold one:—

(i) To give a definition of what constitutes a visible branch of the Universal or Catholic Church;

(ii) To refute the doctrine persistently urged in many quarters as to the infallibility and inerrancy of one particular branch of it, viz., the Church of Rome[2].

iv. **Source.** The Article is based on the Seventh Article of the Augsburg Confession, the language of which was with some considerable modification introduced into the Thirteen Articles of 1538. It also resembles very nearly the language of the *Institution of a Christian Man* and similar formularies.

v. **The word Church** is represented in the original of the New Testament by the Greek Ἐκκλησία[3]. This term, which originally denoted an assembly of persons at Athens called out by the voice of a herald for the purpose of legislation, was used in the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament to describe the entire assembly or congre-

[1] It had reference to the teaching of a branch of the Anabaptists, who "by putting forth the plea of preternatural illumination, made themselves superior to the moral law, and circulated opinions respecting it 'most evidently repugnant to the Holy Scripture.'" Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 103, ed. 1859.

[2] This portion of the Articles finds a parallel in the *Reformatio Legum*, where we read, "Etiam illorum insania legum vinculis est constringenda, qui Romanam ecclesiam in hujusmodi petra fundatam esse existimant, ut nec erraverit, nec errare possit; cum et multi possint ejus errores ex superiore majorum memoria repeti, et etiam ex hac nostra proferri, partim in his quibus vita nostra debet informari, partim etiam in his quibus fides debet institui." De Hæresibus, c. 21, quoted in Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 387, ed. 1859.

[3] On the etymology of the English word Church, see *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 218, n. 2, and Appendix II. p. 311.

gation of the Israelites[1]. The word was subsequently adopted by our Lord to describe the great Society[2], which He came on earth to found, and into which He bade His Apostles invite members not from one nation only, namely, the Jewish, but from the whole world.

vi. **The Church Visible.** It is remarked in the Fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538 that the word "Ecclesia," Church, has two significations in Holy Scripture:—

(α) First it denotes the congregation of all saints and true believers, who truly believe in Christ their Head, and are sanctified by His Spirit. "This," it says, "is the living and truly holy mystical Body of Christ, but it is known to God alone, Who alone seeth the hearts of men";

(β) Secondly it denotes "the congregation of all men, who have been baptized in Christ, and have not openly denied Christ, or been justly and by His word excommunicated[3]."

Respecting the Church in its double aspect, as Visible and Invisible, the Articles have already spoken by implication. They accept the Creeds, which deal not only with the Church "militant here in Earth," but also[4] with the

[1] Who were called out from the rest of the world to bear witness to His Unity, to preserve His Laws, to keep alive the hope of redemption, and to exhibit the pattern of a people living in righteousness and true holiness. Comp. Deut. xxxi. 30; 3 Kings viii. 14, LXX.; 1 Chron. xiii. 2; xxix. 20, LXX. See also Acts vii. 38.

[2] It is used by Him for the first time on the occasion of S. Peter's memorable confession, Matt. xvi. 18, and again, Matt. xviii. 17.

[3] "Ecclesia præter alias acceptiones in scripturis duas habet præcipuas; unam, qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium sanctorum et vere fidelium, qui Christo capiti vere credunt, et sanctificantur Spiritu ejus. Hæc autem vivum est et vere sanctum Christi corpus mysticum, sed soli Deo cognitum, qui hominum corda solus intuetur. Altera acceptio est qua Ecclesia accipitur pro congregatione omnium hominum qui baptizati sunt in Christo et non palam abnegarunt Christum, nec justè et per ejus verbum sunt excommunicati." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 263, ed. 1859.

[4] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, pp. 223—238.

Church "at rest" behind the veil, whose members have departed this life, and whom God "hath knit together in one communion and fellowship with the living members of Christ's mystical Body[1]." The present Article deals with the Church as in any given country she is a visible[2] society of men, and has a visible order of living ministers dispensing her means of Grace[3].

vii. **Analysis.** The definition of a visible branch of the Catholic Church is that it is

"A congregation of faithful men[4], in which

(α) The pure Word of God is preached, and

(β) The Sacraments be duly ministered[5] according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same[6]."

[1] See the Collect for All Saints' Day.

[2] "It is certain that the Article confines itself to the consideration of the visible Church, and gives us no authoritative statement concerning the invisible Church." Bp Browne, *Articles*, p. 453.

[3] We find the word "Church" applied in the Scriptures, sometimes (i) to the whole collective body of Christians scattered throughout the world (Acts xx. 28; 1 Cor. x. 32; Eph. v. 23); sometimes (ii) to a community of Christians in a particular town or country, as Jerusalem (Acts viii. 1), Antioch (Acts xiii. 1), Ephesus (Acts xx. 17), Corinth (1 Cor. i. 2); sometimes (iii) to a single body of Christians meeting or living in a private house, as that of Priscilla and Aquila (Rom. xvi. 5), that of Nymphas (Col. iv. 15), that of Philemon (Phil. 2).

[4] Fidelium. Fidelis here does not denote, as in Classical Latin, *trusty*, *faithful* men (comp. Livy xxii. 37, 4, "boni fidelesque socii"), but men professing faith, i.e. in our Lord Jesus Christ. It corresponds to such expressions as we find in Acts ii. 44, *πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*: iv. 32, *πλήθους τῶν πιστευσάντων*: xix. 2, *ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες*: xix. 18, *πολλοί τε τῶν πεπιστευκότων*.

[5] Bishop Ridley adds to the above marks of a branch of the Church "charity" and "faithful observance of ecclesiastical discipline, according to the Word of God." Ridley's *Works*, Park. Soc. Ed. p. 123; Nowel's Catechism mentions besides sound doctrine and right use of the Sacraments "the use of just discipline."

[6] That the Article does not define the *Catholic* or *Universal* Church, but rather indicates certain conditions necessary in order to constitute any given National Church a branch of the Universal Church, is clear from (α) the use of the word "Church" in the context as applied to National Churches, (β) the implied reference to some canonical authority supreme in respect alike of a "Norma Prædicationis," and of the administration of the Sacraments.

viii. **The Church a Visible Society.** That the Church would form a visible company or Society is the uniform teaching of prophecy and of our Lord Himself. Thus

(i) (α) Isaiah says, *It shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it* (Isai. ii. 2);

(β) Again, Daniel prophesies, *The God of heaven shall set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever* (Dan. ii. 44).

(ii) Again, our Lord speaks of the Society He was about to establish as a kingdom visible as any earthly kingdom, and He compares it to

(α) A field in which good seed and bad grow together until the harvest (Matt. xiii. 24—30);

(β) A net enclosing good and bad fish, which are not separated till the net is drawn ashore (Matt. xiii. 47—50);

(γ) A marriage-feast, where all the guests are not provided with wedding-garments (Matt. xxii. 1—14).

All these passages indicate that the Church, wherever found, is not merely a spiritual and mystical communion, but a visible body[1] of professed believers in the Gospel which Christ proclaimed.

[1] "The Church is always a visible society of men." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* iii. 1, 14.

ix. **The First Mark**, according to the Article, of such a visible body or society is that in it "the pure Word of God is preached." With this Scripture agrees. For our Lord promised the Apostles that when *the Spirit of truth was come, He would guide them into all the truth*[1] (John xvi. 13), and He bade them *go...and make disciples of all the nations...teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them* (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). Hence S. Paul recognises it as the primary part of his Apostolic mission *to preach the Gospel* (1 Cor. i. 17); he sternly rebukes any who dared to preach *any Gospel other than that which they had received* (Gal. i. 9); and he affirms that the Church is *the pillar and ground of the truth*[2] (1 Tim. iii. 15). Now we may believe that in the Church "the pure word of God is preached" wherever the main doctrines contained in the Holy Scriptures and the Creeds[3] are taught. Thus the Church justifies her title to be an *Ecclesia docens* when she communicates to her children the truths which God has revealed respecting alike the Person, Nature, and Work of our Lord, and the destinies of Creation; when "she impresses on the intellects of men the true doctrine of Christ—by oral instruction, by the development of a school of theology, by symbolical and suggestive rites, by catechetical teaching, by preserving and interpreting Holy Writ[4]." For not

[1] "The order of the original is remarkable; the truth in all its parts (*τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν*, according to the true reading)." Christ is the Way and the Truth. The Spirit of Truth leads men into the way and *thus into all the truth*. Comp. Westcott *in loc.*

[2] *Στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, the pillar and basis of the truth.* Ἑδραίωμα occurs nowhere else in N.T. *Στῦλον αὐτὴν καὶ ἑδραίωμα ἐκάλεσεν, ὡς ἂν ἐν αὐτῇ τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν σύστασιν ἐχούσης*, Theodorus. "Were there no Church, there would be no witness, no guardian of archives, no basis, nothing whereon acknowledged truth could rest." Bp Ellicott *in loc.*

[3] The fact that the first five Articles of the Thirty-nine are almost a repetition and enforcement of the chief truths contained in the three Creeds, and that the Eighth treats of the Creeds themselves, has no unimportant bearing on this point.

[4] Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 268.

merely is the abiding conviction of these truths important as regards the leading a holy life, and the attainment of salvation hereafter, but their acceptance belongs to that supernatural life, which, begun on earth, receives its fulness in the eternal world that is to come.

x. **The Second Mark** of a Church visible is that therein "the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same." For the Sacraments are essential to the existence of the Church. They are the ordained means whereby the virtue that proceedeth from Christ the Head flows into His Body, the Church Universal and its members in particular[1]. This is only analogous to what had already been recognised under the Jewish Dispensation. God declared Circumcision and the celebration of the Passover to be essential to membership of the congregation of Israel, and he who neglected or rejected either was to be cut off from the people of Israel (Gen. xvii. 14; Exod. xii. 15). Hence, when our Lord founded His Church, He appointed two Sacraments to take the place of the two great ordinances of Judaism, (i) Baptism, for the initiation of the adult or the child into the Church, and (ii) the Holy Eucharist, for maintaining the communion thus begun between Himself and the members of His mystical Body[2] (Matt. xxviii. 19; xxvi. 26—29). These two Sacraments, ordained by Christ Himself, are as essen-

[1] "That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of His whole Church by Sacraments He severally deriveth into every member thereof." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lvii. 5.

[2] "We receive Christ Jesus in baptism once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist often, as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life.... Each sacrament having both that which is general or common, and that also which is peculiar unto itself, we may hereby gather that the participation of Christ which properly belongeth to any one sacrament is not otherwise to be obtained but by the Sacrament whereunto it is proper." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v.

tial[1] to the existence of the Christian Church as Circumcision and the observance of the Passover were to that of the Jewish Church, and as such were steadily administered by the Apostles and those who succeeded them from the earliest times.

xi. **Due Administration.** It is to be observed, however, that in mentioning the mark of a visible Church, the Article does not speak of the bare administration of the Sacraments. It says they must be "*duly* ministered[2]," that is, in their celebration the conditions of a valid Sacrament must be observed. Thus

(α) In the administration of Holy Baptism there must be the element of water, and the repetition of the Baptismal Formula[3];

(β) In the Holy Eucharist there must be a definite *materies*, bread and wine, and the recitation of a definite form of the words of consecration by one duly ordained to pronounce them[4].

xii. **The Second Part** of the Article deals with the claims of one particular Branch of the Church, viz. the Church of Rome, to be free from error. In dealing with this plea of inerrancy the Article does not merely take up a polemical position, it treats the question historically also. Instead of barely stating that the Roman Church has

[1] Sacraments are the powerful instruments of God to eternal life. For as our natural life consisteth "in the union of the body with the soul, so our life supernatural in the union of the soul with God." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lvii. 1.

[2] "*Recte* administrantur." "Quoad ea quæ *necessario* exiguntur, juxta Christi institutum."

[3] For the water alone or the words alone are not sufficient. Nor must there be any words, but only certain definite words. There must be the proper *materies* and the proper *forma*. As regards the *minister* of this Sacrament the Church holds, as laid down in A.D. 1439 at the Council of Florence, that "in casu necessitatis licere laico, seu viro, seu feminae, seu Christiano, seu pagano baptizare, modo adsint materia, forma et intentio debita." Bellarm. *Opera, De Sacr. Bapt.* i. 7.

[4] See Bp Browne, p. 466; Bp Forbes, 269, 270.

erred, it declares that freedom from error did not distinguish certain even of the most ancient Churches of the East. It mentions the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, before it speaks of Rome at all. It selects these Churches, because the Church of Jerusalem was in historical order the mother Church of Christendom; because Alexandria and Antioch were always recognised as standing in the first rank amongst the primitive Churches, and being the most distinguished of those founded by Apostles or Apostolic men were in this respect on a par with the Church of Rome. None of these Churches claimed inerrancy any more than those spoken of in the Apocalypse of S. John[1].

xiii. **Points of Error.** The Article does not distinctly state what are the errors to which allusion is made. It simply states that as the Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria have erred, so the Church of Rome hath erred in mode of life, ceremonial, and matters of faith, and therefore cannot claim inerrancy any more than these Patriarchates[2]. The term "living" probably alludes to the low moral tone and the corruptions which had crept into the Papal curia in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries; the "manner of ceremonies" to the denial of the chalice to the laity, and the superstitious veneration of relics and images; and the "matters of

[1] Thus the Church of Ephesus is charged with having *left her first love* (Rev. ii. 4); the Church of Pergamum with *holding the doctrine of Balaam and of the Nicolaitans* (Rev. ii. 14, 15); the Church of Thyatira with tolerating the errors of *the woman Jezebel*, and with moral deterioration (Rev. ii. 20); the Church of Sardis with having *no works of hers fulfilled before God* (Rev. iii. 2); the Church of Laodicea with being *neither cold nor hot*, but *lukewarm*, and deserving *to be spewed out of the mouth* of her Lord (Rev. iii. 16).

[2] It is noticeable that the word "their" is only found in the English version of the Article. In the draft of 1553, it ran "not only in *their* living, but also in matters of *their* faith"; while "cæremoniarum ritus" was inserted in the Latin version of 1553, it was lacking in the English version of the same date.

faith" to the additions[1] made to the primitive Creeds by that of Pope Pius IV., which additions the Council of Trent declares to be binding on all the Churches of the Roman obedience[2]. But whatever be the object of the Article, whether to state that the corruptions which had crept in were the ground of the need of a Reformation, or to protest against the claim to infallibility by itself on the part of the Roman Church, in neither case does it militate against the inerrancy of the whole Church collectively[3]. The fact that practical corruptions had crept in was virtually owned in the Roman Church by the attempts at reform, which were instituted again and again, but without much effect.

[1] By "matters of faith" it is not intended to express Articles of the Creeds, or the fundamental doctrines in them. To reject these would involve heresy and not merely error. See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 467.

[2] These include, amongst other points, Seven Sacraments, Transubstantiation, Denial of the Cup to the Laity, Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Relics, the Roman Church the mother and mistress of all Churches.

[3] See Pusey's *Eirenicon*, pp. 33, 34.

Article XX.

1563.

De Ecclesiæ autoritate.

Habet Ecclesia Ritus statuendi ius, et in fidei controuersijs autoritatem, quamuis Ecclesiæ non licet quicquam instituere, quod verbo Dei scripto aduersetur, nec unum scripturæ locum sic exponere potest, ut alteri contradicat. Quare licet Ecclesia sit diuinorum librorum testis et conseruatrix, attamen vt aduersus eos nihil decernere, ita præter illos nihil credendum de necessitate salutis debet obtrudere.

1571.

Of the auctoritie of the Church.

The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and auctoritie in controuersies of fayth: And yet it is not lawfull for the Church to ordayne any thyng that is contrarie to Gods worde written, neyther may it so expounde one place of scripture, that it be repugnaunt to another. Wherefore, although the Churche be a witnesse and a keeper of holy writ: yet, as it ought not to decree any thing agaynst the same, so besides the same, ought it not to enforce any thing to be beleued for necessitie of saluation.

i. **Connection.** Having dealt with the marks distinguishing a Branch of the Church visible, the Twentieth Article proceeds to deal with the authority of the Church in matters of ritual and ceremony, and also in controversies of faith.

ii. **Title and Language.** Though the Title of the Article has never been altered, the language has undergone considerable change since the first draft in 1553. As then drawn up, it lacked the first clause altogether, and began with the words, "It is not lawful for the Church, to ordain anything, that is contrary to God's word written." The first clause was lacking not only in the first draft of 1553, but also in the first draft of the Elizabethan Articles of

1563, and it is not found in the Parker MSS. of the Articles preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge[1].

iii. **The First Clause.** So serious did the controversy respecting the first clause become, especially on the part of the Puritans in the time of Charles I., that one of the charges brought by them against Archbishop Laud was that he had invented it, and in self-defence he was obliged to bring forward an attested copy of the original draft from the records of Canterbury, which had long existed in the archives of St Paul's Cathedral, and which records afterwards perished in the Great Fire of London in 1666[2]. The Parker MSS., however, though of great authority, do not present us with the final draft of the Thirty-nine Articles, but with an earlier draft while they were in process of completion, and before the royal assent was given. Before that assent was accorded this clause was added, and was taken by Archbishop Parker from the Confession of Würtemberg, whence, as we have

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 141 sqq., ed. 1859. The clause "*is* found (1) in an early Latin draft of the Articles, among the Elizabethan State Papers, where it was inserted by the same hand, after the draft itself was made, so as to fill exactly one line. (2) In the *Latin* Edition of Reynold Wolfe, 1563, as expressly authorised by the Queen. (3) In two or more English editions of Jugge and Cawood in 1571. (4) In six or more English editions from 1581 to 1628; and in all subsequent copies. (5) In the transcript made in 1637 from an original copy of the Articles, as deposited in the registry of the See of Canterbury." Hardwick, p. 145, ed. 1859.

[2] "The testimony of that record was produced upon the trial of archbishop Laud, in the most open and explicit manner, at a time when it was perfectly accessible to his accusers, or rather was in the hands of his infuriated enemies, and yet 'not one of them ever ventured to question the truth of the assertions, or attempted to invalidate the proof on which his defence had rested.'" Hardwick, pp. 146 sq., quoting *British Critic*, 1829, p. 96. Heylin writes, "Having occasion to consult the records of Convocation, I found this controverted clause, *verbatim*, in these following words; 'Habet ecclesia ritus statuendi jus et in fidei controversiis authoritatem.'" *Examen Historicum*, pp. 144, 145. The language of this controverted clause is analogous to that employed by the Würtemberg theologians, "Credimus et confitemur quod...hæc *Ecclesia habeat jus judicandi de omnibus doctrinis.*" De Ecclesia.

seen, most of the additions made in the reign of Queen Elizabeth were derived.

iv. **The Object** of the Article is twofold:—

(1) To check the waywardness of the Anabaptists, who in their zeal against ritual went so far as to deny that the Church had any authority whatsoever in matters of ceremonial[1];

(2) To discountenance extravagant notions as to the authority of the Church held by the extreme Mediæval School.

v. **Analysis.** In its present shape the Article affirms three points:—

(α) That "the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies[2]";

(β) That she hath "authority in Controversies of Faith";

(γ) That she is "a witness and a keeper of holy Writ."

But this authority is limited by two conditions:—

(1) The Church must not "ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written";

(2) She must not "enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation" besides the Word written.

vi. **The First Point.** When the Article lays it down that "the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies," it does not of course refer to the Sacraments, or things of the same nature as Sacraments. It intends, by

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* pp. 101, 102.

[2] "Habet Ecclesia Ritus [sive cæremonias] statuendi jus." The two words in brackets, though represented in the English version, do not appear in the original Latin edition, nor in the copy, alluded to above, which Heylin found amongst the records of Convocation.

the terms used, things in themselves comparatively indifferent, "the adjuncts and accidents, not the essence and substance of holy things[1]." That the Church has power to decree these may be proved,

(α) From the analogy of the Jewish Church;

(β) From the custom of the primitive Christian Church.

(1) *The Jewish Church* possessed a Ceremonial Law of the utmost minuteness, given to Moses by God Himself. This might have been supposed to be incapable of receiving any addition. Yet we find that the Jews actually added to the Feasts appointed by the Law, (α) *The Feast of Purim* in memory of the delivery of the nation from the cruel designs of Haman (Esth. ix. 26—28), and (β) *The Feast of Dedication* in commemoration of the re-dedication of the Temple after its pollution by Antiochus Epiphanes[2] (1 Macc. iv. 52—59);

(2) *In the Primitive Church*, (*a*) we find a Council held at Jerusalem respecting the question of the observance of Circumcision by the Gentile converts (Acts xv. 28, 29); (*b*) we find S. Paul deciding such points as the veiling of women in the Christian assemblies (1 Cor. xi. 4—16), and their keeping silence in church (1 Cor. xiv. 34); (*c*) we find him giving directions respecting the reverent celebration of the Holy Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 17—34), and (*d*) laying it down that *if any person was disposed to be contentious* on

[1] Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 475.

[2] And this Feast, though its institution does not fall within the period covered by the sacred Canon, was observed by our Lord Himself (John x. 22).

such points, he was bound to yield his judgment to the customs of the Church (1 Cor. xi. 16)[1]. Thus he plainly accepts the principle that the Church is at liberty to order and arrange the details of public worship, as may be most calculated to honour God and edify the people.

vii. **The Second Point.** But the Church has also "authority in Controversies of Faith[2]." This power was delegated by our Lord to the Apostles on two occasions:—

(α) In *promise* when He assured to S. Peter the power of the keys *to bind and to loose* (Matt. xvi. 17—19)[3];

(β) In *fact* when He bade the Apostles *go...and make disciples of all the nations...teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them* (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20)[4].

The power thus delegated was exercised (α) *Individually* by the Apostles, and (β) *Collectively* by the Church :—

(1) *Individually :—*

As when S. Paul charged the Ephesian elders *to feed the Church of God* and guard it against

[1] Εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. xi. 16. On this verse see Bp. Andrew's *Sermons*, ii. p. 404. The Apostle here intimates "that none of the Churches of God, either those which he had not founded or those properly his own, allow such procedure in their ecclesiastical usages." Godet *in loc.*

[2] The power of the Church to decree Rites or Ceremonies is allowed to the smallest Diocese, but her authority in Controversies of Faith is capable of no such delegation; when a National or Provincial or Diocesan Church deals with "Controversies of Faith," her standard is not mere local Use, but the dogmas of the Universal Church.

[3] "Peter is to have the duties and powers, not of the master of the house —that Christ is and remains—but of the steward... What is here first, according to S. Matthew's account, only *promised* to Peter, was after the Resurrection bestowed upon him, at the third appearance of Jesus." Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 48.

[4] See also John xxi. 15 sqq.

false teachers (Acts xx. 28—30)[1]; when he bade Timothy guard *that which had been committed unto him*[2] (1 Tim. vi. 20), and *hand on* the treasure of truth *to faithful men, who should be able to teach others also* (2 Tim. ii. 2); when he wrote to Titus to *hold to the faithful word which was according to the teaching, that he might be able both to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayers* (Titus i. 9);

(2) *Collectively:*—

As when the Council of Nicæa[3] settled the Catholic doctrine respecting the Deity of Christ, availing itself of new terms, rejecting them in the wrong sense and accepting them in the right; and when later Councils laid down the true doctrine respecting the Person and Work of the Holy Ghost.

Thus the Church, having the assurance of the presence and guidance of Him Who is her Head, is authorized to give judgment in matters of faith, and has a promise of direction in so doing.

viii. **The Third Point.** But the Church is also, as the Article next proceeds to declare, "a witness and a keeper of holy Writ." This is in strict analogy with the function of the Jewish Church. Under the Old Testament Dispensation the Elect Nation was charged with the custody of *the*

[1] The prerogatives of the Apostolate were derived directly from God; they ceased to exist with the death of the last of the original recipients of them; one of these prerogatives was the *individual*, as distinct from the *collective* exercise of "authority in Controversies of Faith" over the Universal Church. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. pp. 97, 113 sqq. E. T. 1877.

[2] Τὴν παραθήκην = *the deposit.* Comp. R.V., margin.

[3] "The Council of Nice was assembled for the deciding of the controversy of Arius, and the time of the celebrating of Easter, the first of which was clearly a controversy of faith, the other a mere rite or ceremony." Bp. Beveridge *on the Articles.*

oracles of God (Rom. iii. 2)[1], and every Sabbath the Scriptures were read in the Synagogues (Acts xv. 21). So to the Christian Church the Scriptures of the New Testament are entrusted as a sacred deposit to guard and to keep. How she did this in early times we have already seen[2]. Existing, as she did, in full vitality before any of the Books of the New Testament were written[3], she carefully distinguished them from the spurious writings, which might have taken their place; she collected the accepted writings into a Canon[4]; she drew the line between those she deemed of primary and Apostolic authority, and others which she did not recognise as attaining to this position. Since then she has continued to read the Scripture in her assemblies; to translate them into the vernacular tongue of many of her children; to place them in their hands; to instruct from them by preaching and catechising; and to foster a reverence for them as the *living oracles* of God. Thus the Church has proved herself "a witness and a keeper of holy Writ."

[1] Ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ. For a similar use of λόγια comp. Psl. xi. 7 LXX., τὰ λόγια κυρίου λόγια ἁγνά; Acts vii. 38, ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν; Heb. v. 12, τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ Θεοῦ.

"The Old Testament passed from the Jewish into the Christian Church as a sacred document, henceforth hers of right, which bore witness to Christ and His Church, and which both had been fulfilled and would be further fulfilled through Him, and the institution He founded." Döllinger, *Church of the First Age*, i. p. 240.

[2] See above, *Article* vi. "If the Church had not carefully guarded the Scriptures at first, they would have been scattered and lost, and spurious writings would have partially taken the place of the true." Bp Browne, p. 474.

[3] Moreover they were written for those who were already members of the Church, and had received her primary instruction. Comp. Luke i. 4; Heb. v. 12.

[4] "Mere historical evidence will show that S. John wrote the Fourth Gospel, and that S. Paul wrote the Epistles to the Corinthians. On the other hand we want something more than mere historical evidence to justify the position of the anonymous Epistle to the Hebrews within the Canon. Thus the Books of the New Testament will not stand alone either (i) in their entirety, or (ii) as all inspired, apart from the witness of the Church of which they form a part and to whose antecedent authority they themselves testify." See Gore's *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 56 *n.*

ix. **The Limiting Clauses.** But the Article closes with two important limiting clauses respecting the Authority of the Church:—

(α) "It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another[1]." The authority of the Church is so far not an unlimited and independent authority that the truth, to which she bears witness, comes from God, and not from her. God is the legislator, and the Scriptures contain the code of laws which He has ordained. Whatsoever authority, therefore, the Church possesses cannot be superior to God Himself. Her position is subordinate to Him, and she cannot ordain anything contrary to His Word written, nor wrest Scripture to justify her in so doing[2].

(β) Moreover "besides the same (holy Writ) it (the Church) ought not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of Salvation." This limitation applies especially to doctrine, and is almost a repetition of part of the Sixth Article[3].

[1] The limitation carries with it a strong view of the *positive* functions of the Church. "If the Church may not expound one place in Scripture that it be contrary to another, this limitation implies that the Church is the expounder as well as the keeper and witness of Scripture." Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, i. p. 336, quoting Pusey's *Necessity of Theological Learning, especially in the Church of England.*

[2] Bp Browne, p. 480. A Canon of the Convocation, which imposed on the clergy subscription to the Articles, directs preachers "to be careful that they never teach aught in a sermon to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from that same doctrine."

[3] The limitation of the powers of the Church "is involved in the idea of its being under the real and not the imaginary government of a Divine Head, who can and will call it to account, if it mistakes its functions or forgets its responsibilities." F. D. Maurice *on the Articles*, p. 51.

The function of the Church is not to *reveal* truth, but to *guard the truth revealed*, and to hold fast what she has received. She cannot sanction the imposition of new dogmas, or enforce upon her children novel articles of Faith, for which there is no authority in the Bible. Her position is that of a witness to and a teacher of *the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints* (Jude 3). Her authority is so far "ministerial and declaratory, not absolute or supreme[1]." The Holy Scriptures are the sole Charter of the Faith; the Church is the interpreter, and her vocation is to unfold the old, not to reveal new truth[2].

[1] Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 480.

[2] "Interpretem Scripturæ Ecclesiam agnoscimus, et plerasque res in Scripturis non expressas ab ea definiri fatemur. Sed id simul affirmamus, oportere Ecclesiam sequi in utroque Scripturarum authoritatem." Bucer, quoted by Hardwick, p. 338, ed. 1859.

Article XXI.

1563.

De autoritate Conciliorum Generalium.

Generalia Concilia sine iussu et uoluntate principum congregari non possunt, et vbi conuenerint, quia ex hominibus constant, qui non omnes spiritu et uerbis[1] Dei reguntur, et errare possunt, et interdum errarunt, etiam in hijs quæ ad normam pietatis pertinent: ideo quæ ab illis constituuntur, ut ad salutem necessaria, neque robur habent, neque autoritatem, nisi ostendi possint è sacris literis esse desumpta.

1571.

Of the aucthoritie of generall Counselles.

Generall Counsels may not be gathered together without the commaundement and wyll of princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuche as they be an assemblie of men, whereof all be not gouerned with the spirite and word of God) they may erre, and sometyme haue erred, euen in thinges parteynyng vnto God. Wherfore thinges ordayned by them as necessary to saluation, haue neyther strength nor aucthoritie, vnlesse it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

i. **Title and Language.** The Title of this Article has been uniform since the first draft in 1553. But in the text itself there is one important variation. In 1553 after the words "may err, and sometimes have erred," the clause ran "*not only in worldly matters, but also* in things pertaining unto God." The words in italics were omitted in 1563.

ii. **Object and Analyses.** The object of the Article is a threefold one:—

(1) To set forth the channel or organ, through

[1] The Parker MS. of 1563 reads thus, with however the correction by a later hand from "verbis" into "verbo." Comp. Hardwick, p. 303, ed. 1859.

which the voice and judgment of the Church receive expression, viz. General Councils;

(2) To vindicate the right of the Civil Authority to gather them together;

(3) To lay it down that, even when so gathered together,

(*a*) "They may err, and sometimes have erred";

(*b*) That in matters necessary to salvation their decrees "have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture."

iii. **The New Testament** furnishes a distinct precedent in principle for Church Councils. In the Acts of the Apostles we find "the Apostles and Elders[1]" meeting together to consider solemnly the question of imposing or not imposing circumcision on the Gentile converts. In it S. James presides as Bishop of Jerusalem, the Apostles and Elders formally deliberate, and issue the decree, which goes forth in the name of the whole body (Acts xv.)[2].

iv. **Diocesan and Provincial Councils** were, therefore, modelled on this precedent, and were summoned from time to time, especially during the third century, for determining matters of doctrine and discipline. Thus Victor held a council at Rome A.D. 196, respecting the keeping of Easter, and in the same year other Councils

[1] It is "the Apostles and Elders" who come together to consider the matter (Acts xv. 6). Yet *πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος* are present (*ib.* 12), but as listening. It is "the Apostles and Elders with the whole Church" who make the decree (*ib.* 22). Prof. Hort's *Judaic Christianity*, p. 68.

[2] "Strictly speaking, the assembly, over which he presided, was an assembly of the Church of Jerusalem only, to receive a deputation from the Church of Antioch. And it differed from the Church Councils also in the actual presence in it of Apostles. But this difference only strengthens the case as a precedent for mutual deliberation on the part of the Church collectively." See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiquities*, i. 474, b.

were summoned in other places on the same subject. Cyprian held several councils at Carthage between A.D. 253 and 255 on the vexed question of the treatment of the lapsed and the rebaptism of heretics. Councils were also held at Antioch, A.D. 264, 265, respecting the heretical teaching of Paul of Samosata.

v. **The first Œcumenical Council** was summoned in A.D. 325 by the Emperor Constantine at Nicæa, and consisted entirely of Bishops of the Roman Empire, who owed allegiance to the Emperor[1]. It met to deal with the Arian heresy. (2) In A.D. 381 the Council of Constantinople was summoned by the Emperor Theodosius to deal with the opinions of Macedonius. (3) In A.D. 431 the Council of Ephesus was summoned by Theodosius II. to condemn the Nestorian heresy. (4) In A.D. 451 the Council of Chalcedon, suggested and requested by Leo the Great, was actually summoned by the Emperor Marcianus to condemn the heresy of Eutyches. (5) In A.D. 553 the second Council of Constantinople was summoned by the Emperor Justinian, and confirmed the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. (6) In A.D. 680 the third Council of Constantinople was summoned by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, and condemned the Monothelite heresy. These six are the only Councils, which have been acknowledged by the Universal Church. The fifth and sixth, however, have not been quite so universally esteemed as the first four, of which Gregory the Great was wont to say that "he reverenced them as he did the four Evangelists[2]."

[1] The term "Œcumenical Council" first occurs in Euseb. *Vit. Constantin.* iii. 6, and again in *Concil. Constantin.* A.D. 381, it denoted a Council "*totius orbis*" (S. Aug. *de Bapt. c. Don.* i. 7), a "*plenarium* universæ ecclesiæ" (S. Aug. *Epist.* 162), as distinguished from a Council "provinciarum," or "regionum."

[2] Gregor. *Epist. ad Joann. Constantinop. Episc.* Epp. Lib i. c. 24. On the acknowledgment of the first four General Councils by the law of England see Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* VIII. ii. 17.

vi. **In the first three Centuries** no General Council was ever held, for there was no one Christian power, which could summon all the bishops together, and which, when summoned, they would be bound to obey. But when the Roman Empire became subject to one man, and that man was a Christian and a protector of the Church, then his power enabled him to summon all bishops, who were under his sway, and he could compel their attendance. While the Roman Empire lasted, it was possible for this to be done. But when the Empire was divided, and its Eastern portion separated from the West, and later still, when Europe was split up into several nationalities, each having its own sovereign, and each speaking, more or less, its own language, the question arose who could summon a General Council? The power to do this was claimed by the Bishop of Rome, as possessing an universal dominion over the Church of Christ by virtue of his succession to the Primacy of S. Peter, and he began to exercise the power, hitherto enjoyed only by the Emperors, of calling together General Councils of the Church.

vii. **Power claimed by the Pope.** But whereas, when Emperors summoned such Councils, all parts of Christendom obeyed, it was not so when the Pope claimed to exercise the same authority. The bishops, indeed, of the Roman obedience, felt bound to obey the summons, but the bishops of the ancient patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, refused to assemble at the command of the Patriarch of the West[1]. The Article, therefore, asserts that princes only have a right to summon General Councils, not on the ground of their possessing any inherent, inalienable, claim to do so, but because they alone have power to compel attendance at them. Hence

[1] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 485.

when the Pope called the Council of Trent, the English bishops and Convocation refused to acknowledge his right to summon it, holding that "neither the Bishop of Rome, nor any one prince of what state, degree, or preeminence soever he be, may by his own authority call, indict, or summon any General Council, without the express consent, assent, and agreement of the residue of Christian princes[1]."

viii. **Councils may err.** When the Article asserts that, even when Councils are gathered together, they may err and have erred, it has been observed that this must be understood of General Councils "that pass for such[2]." The Councils summoned by the Pope, and acknowledged by the Churches of the Roman obedience[3], were commonly regarded as General Councils at the time the Articles were drawn up, as they are now in the Roman Communion. But the decrees of these Councils, though called General, have never been received by the Oriental Churches, and cannot therefore be said to be of universal authority. They may pass for such, but they have no real justification for the claim.

ix. **Supremacy of Scripture.** When General Councils are gathered together, whence do they derive their authority? The answer was symbolized in ancient times by placing a copy of the Holy Gospels on a throne in the midst of the

[1] See the Judgment of Convocation respecting General Councils in the Appendix to Cranmer's *Works*, vol. iv. p. 258. In the sixteenth century "it became more and more evident to the English princes and the English people that they must take their own ground. They had no choice. They could not hope to reform their Church by the help of foreigners. They must give up allegiance to their Sovereigns, they must give up their faith that Christ had called England to be a Church, if they made the attempt." F. D. Maurice, *Serm. on the Articles*, p. 53.

[2] Bishop Burnet quoted by Bishop Browne *on the Articles*, p. 490.

[3] The Councils allowed as General by the Latin Church are the First Council of Lateran A.D. 1123; the Second Lateran A.D. 1139; the Third Lateran A.D. 1179; the Fourth Lateran A.D. 1215; Lyons A.D. 1245; Lyons A.D. 1274; Vienna A.D. 1311; Constance A.D. 1414; Basle A.D. 1431; Florence A.D. 1439; Fifth Lateran A.D. 1512; Trent A.D. 1546.

assembly, as a type of the source whence all true doctrine came[1]. It was always assumed in the early ages that the duty of a Council was, not to propound new objects of belief, but to declare what had been the faith from the beginning[2]. A Council must witness to a continuous tradition, and give authority to its enunciation, but it cannot teach anything as of divine faith, which it does not trace up to the Holy Scriptures[3]. The language of the Council of Carthage, A.D. 348, when it declares that it makes its decrees "mindful of the Divine precepts, and of the magisterial authority of the Divine Scriptures," enunciates an important principle which applies to all Councils. When the decrees of a Council come forth, if they concern things necessary to salvation, we should esteem them to "have neither strength nor authority," until they have been compared with and can be declared to be taken out of Holy Scripture. But when the Church is satisfied that they have this authority, and has fully received them, then they assume the form of "judgments of the Church" concerning the doctrines of Scripture[4]. This was the case with

[1] See *Introduction to the Creeds*, p. 26, and also p. 175, n.

[2] Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, p. 298. Hooker speaks of General Councils as "those reverend, religious, and sacred consultations.....a thing whereof God's own blessed Spirit was the author; a thing practised by the holy Apostles themselves; a thing always afterwards kept and observed throughout the world; a thing never otherwise than most highly esteemed of, till pride, ambition, and tyranny began by factious and vile endeavours to abuse that divine invention unto the furtherance of wicked purposes." *Eccl. Pol.* I. x. 14.

[3] A General Council is not a necessity. It was impossible from one set of causes for the first three hundred years, but all through that period men like Irenæus and Tertullian were not prevented from arriving at the mind of the Church by the comparison of traditions. "The judgment of the Church *diffusive*," says Mr Wilberforce, "is no less binding than that of the Church *collective*." *Principles of Church Authority*, p. 77, quoted by Gore, *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 52.

[4] By *Stat.* i. Eliz. c. 1, the Commissioners, in their judgment of heresies were enjoined to adhere in the first place, to the authority of the Canonical Scriptures; secondly to the decisions of the first four General Councils; and thirdly to the decision of any other General Council, founded on the *express* and *plain* words of Holy Scripture. See Hardwick, p. 388, ed. 1859. The ultimate decision as to the universally binding force of Conciliar

the first four General Councils. They put forth their decisions as their interpretation of the Word of God. All Christendom received these interpretations as sound and true, and from that day to this they have been admitted by the Catholic Church as true Articles of Faith[1].

Decrees, and thus as to the Œcumenical character of the Council whose they are, rests with the educated instinct of the Church; it is a matter for the *consensus post* of Christendom; what is permanent and adequate *persists*, what is transitory and inadequate *passes away*.

[1] See Palmer *On the Church*, Part iv. ch. 8. "While the Church is in her present condition,...we must content ourselves with Councils less than Œcumenical though resting on their basis, and it is quite possible that it was not intended in God's Providence, that the formulation of Œcumenical dogmas should go beyond defining the basis of the Christian faith and life, as it is given in the Creeds. The imposition of a dogma as a condition of communion is a necessary evil, which should be kept within the smallest limits possible in view of the Church's safety; and a Church shows her life not by creating new dogmas, but by living on the old faith, and 'commending it to every man's conscience' by rendering it intelligible in view of new needs to new generations of men." Gore's *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 53.

ARTICLE XXII.

1563.	1571.
De Purgatorio.	*Of Purgatorie.*
Doctrina Romanensium de Purgatorio, de Indulgentijs, de veneratione et adoratione tum Imaginum tum Reliquiarum, nec non de inuocatione Sanctorum, res est futilis, inaniter conficta, et nullis Scripturarum testimonijs innititur, imo verbo Dei contradicit.	The Romishe doctrine concernyng purgatorie, pardons, worshipping and adoration as well of images, as of reliques, and also inuocation of Saintes, is a fonde thing, vainly inuented, and grounded vpon no warrantie of Scripture, but rather repugnaunt to the worde of God.

i. **Connection.** In the previous Article it has been laid down that even in the case of General Councils their decrees must be shewn to be in accordance with Holy Scripture. In the present Article the decision of certain so-called General Councils[1], which had been proclaimed as Articles of Faith, touching a class of subjects, that had become prominent during the Middle Ages, is declared to be "grounded upon no warranty of Scripture," but rather to be "repugnant to the Word of God."

ii. **Title.** The Class of Subjects alluded to includes Purgatory, Indulgences, the Veneration of Images and Relics, and the Invocation of Saints. But it is to be noticed that only one of these subjects, viz., that of Purgatory, is mentioned in the Title, which has been uniform since 1553, while all relate not so much to the

[1] Purgatory at the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439; Indulgences at the First, Third, and Fourth Lateran Councils; Adoration of Images and Relics at Trent, A.D. 1563; the Invocation of Saints at Trent, A.D. 1566.

Church Visible as to the Church Invisible. One important variation in the text must not be passed over. In 1553 the Article began with the words "The doctrine of School Authors[1]," or Scholastic divines, who flourished in the Middle Ages, and derived their name from the Schools attached to the Cathedrals or Universities in which they lectured. This term was altered in 1563 to "The Romish Doctrine[2]," an expression used in the Sixteenth Century to denote the extreme Mediæval party in the Church, who were strongly opposed to the men of the New Learning.

iii. **Object and Analysis.** The object of the Article, then, is to condemn the subtilities of such an extreme Mediæval party respecting the four subjects above specified, and it affirms that their doctrine is (1) "A fond[3]

[1] *Scholasticorum Doctrina.* The Scholastic Divines systematized Divinity by the application to it of the reigning philosophy of Aristotle. The most celebrated were: (1) Albertus Magnus, a Dominican friar, who died A.D. 1280; (2) S. Bonaventura, the *Seraphic Doctor*, A.D. 1221—1279; (3) S. Thomas Aquinas, the *Angelical Doctor*, A.D. 1225—1274; (4) John Duns Scotus, the *Subtil Doctor*, 1274—1308; (5) William Ockham, the *Singular Doctor*, A.D. 1290—1347. The Articles are very far from condemning the Evangelical teaching of great names such as these.

[2] *Doctrina Romanensium.* The terms "Romanenses" and "Romanistæ" were used as far back as 1520 by Luther and Ulrich von Hutten, to designate the extreme Mediæval party. Cranmer, in his "Answer to Gardiner" uses the phrase, "your new *Romish* errors." Hardwick, p. 410, ed. 1890. The alteration of the words "Scholasticorum Doctrina" to "doctrina Romanensium" in 1563, "indicates that it was directed not so much against the formulated statements of Lombard or Aquinas, still less against the earlier teaching of the Greek and Latin Fathers, as against the popular current teaching of the Romish theologians of the time, and so far as the Tridentine decrees, with whatever reserves and limitations, embodied that teaching, they come under that condemnation." Dean Plumptre's *Spirits in Prison*, pp. 307, 308.

[3] *Res futilis.* Futilis from fundo = *I pour out*, denotes (1) *That which is easily poured out*; (2) *That which easily breaks when dropped*, comp. glacies futilis, "brittle ice," Virg. Æn. xii. 740; (3) *empty, poor, worthless*, Cic. Div. i. 19, 36. In the English Version of the Article it is translated *fond* = foolish, from O. E. fonne, "silly," "foolish." Comp.

"Grant that I may never be so
fond,
To trust man on his oath or
bond."

Comp. also Hooker vii. 6, 10, "A *fond* kind of speech, if so be there had been as then in bishops no ruling superiority over presbyters."

thing vainly invented[1]," (2) That it is "grounded upon[2] no warranty of Scripture," (3) But is "rather repugnant[3] to the Word of God."

v. **Purgatory.** The Mediæval doctrine of Purgatory was of gradual growth, and passed through various stages before it reached its final development:—

(1) We have already seen[4] that the Jews and the early Christians believed in the existence of an intermediate state between death and the Final Judgment, but concerning this intermediate state itself, and the nature of the happiness or suffering awaiting the soul there, the earliest Christian Fathers maintained a great reserve[5];

(2) We begin to trace the idea of a purifying fire after death in the writings of Tertullian[6] and Origen, of Gregory Nazianzen[7] and Gregory of

[1] Vainly invented, *inaniter conficta*. In 1553 this was translated "vainlie feigned." Conficta from confingo=*to fabricate, make up, pretend*. Comp. Terence, *Phorm.* i. 81, "hæc omnia conficta," "it is an entirely made up story," "all lies."

[2] *Innititur*=(1) *leans upon*, comp. innititur hastæ, Ovid. *Metam.* xiv. 819; (2) *depends on, is supported by*, "salutem suam incolumitati Pisonis inniti," Tac. *Ann.*, xv. 60.

[3] *Contradicit*, or, as it ran in 1553, "*perniciosè* contradicit."

[4] See above under Article iii., p. 62.

[5] S.Clemens Romanus simply speaks of those who have finished their course in charity as possessing the region of the godly, ἔχουσιν χῶρον εὐσεβῶν. *Ep. ad Cor.* i. 50. S. Justin Martyr describes the souls of the godly as remaining in a certain better place, ἐν κρείττονί τοι χώρῳ μένειν, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, cap. v., while the unjust and wicked remain in a worse, awaiting the day of judgment. "And thus some, appearing worthy of God, die no more, and some are punished (κολάζονται), ἐστ' ἂν αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ Θεὸς θέλῃ (*so long as God wills them to exist and to be punished*)." S. Irenæus argues that "each sort of men receive, even before the judgment, their due place of abode, dignam habitationem unamquamque gentem percipere etiam ante judicium." Iren. Lib. II. 63. S. Clement of Alexandria teaches that "the punishments of God in Hades are remedial and reformatory, and lead to repentance." Clem. Alex. *Strom.*, vi. c. 36.

[6] Not, however, as it would seem, between death and the judgment, but at the revelation of the Great Day.

[7] He speaks of "the baptism of fire awaiting men in the next world, which will devour the material part like hay, and consume the light substance of every kind of sin." Greg. Naz. *Oratio* xxxix.

Nyssa[1], while S. Augustine, commenting on S. Paul's words in 1 Cor. iii. 11—15, speaks of the idea of a purifying fire, which has its seat in Hades, awaiting men after death, as having been suggested by some, and he thinks it not altogether impossible or improbable. He says he will not argue against it[2], but he does not regard the opinion as an article of faith, or a doctrine of the Church, or an established truth, but simply as a not improbable conjecture[3];

(3) A century and a half afterwards, Pope Gregory I. laid it down as his final conclusion that there is a purgatorial fire before the judgment for lighter faults[4]. From this time what had been an opinion with S. Augustine, becomes more or less a settled belief, which was strengthened by legends and dreams[5], by the preaching of Missionaries, like S. Boniface, who taught the

[1] See Dean Plumptre's *The Spirits in Prison*, pp. 139, 140.

[2] "Non redarguo *quia forsitan verum est.*" S. Aug. *De Civ. Dei* xxi. 26; comp. Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, ii. 94—96; Bp Browne *on the Articles*, p. 500; Plumptre, *The Spirits in Prison*, pp. 151, 152.

[3] Comp. S. Aug. *De Fid. et Op.*, c. xvi. 29, "Sive ergo in hac tantum vita ista homines patiuntur, sive etiam post hanc vitam talia quædam judicia subsequuntur, *non abhorret, quantum arbitror, a ratione veritatis iste intellectus hujusce sententiæ*"; also S. Aug. *Enchirid. ad Laurent.*, cap. lxix. "Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri, *incredibile non est*, et *utrum ita sit quæri potest;* et aut inveniri aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusque salvari."

[4] "De quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis credendus est." Gregor. *Dial.*, iv., cap. 39. On purgatory Gregory the Great "is dubious, though his final conclusion seems to be that there is a purgatorial fire, which may purify the soul from very slight sins." Milman, *Latin Christianity*, ii. 157.

[5] Compare the dream of S. Furseus and the vision of Drithelm, as recorded by Bede *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 19; v. 12. "There is a legend of S. Paul himself; of the French monk S. Farcy; of Drithelm related by Bede; of the Emperor Charles the Fat, by William of Malmesbury...The Purgatory of S. Patrick, the Purgatory of Owen Miles, the vision of Alberic of Monte Casino, were amongst the most popular and widespread legends of the ages preceding Dante." Milman's *Latin Christianity*, ix. 93.

doctrine to the newly converted Teutonic tribes[1], by the authors of miracle-plays, by the Schoolmen[2], by poets, like Dante, who sum up the whole popular belief as to the intermediate state of Purgatory;

(4) Although in A.D. 1439 the Council of Florence propounded it as a dogma, though it was not accepted by the Eastern Church[3], and at Trent, A.D. 1563, the Council claiming to be guided by the Holy Spirit, the Scriptures, and the Tradition of the Fathers, formally decreed that there is a Purgatory, and that souls detained[4] therein are aided by the sacrifice of the altar[5], but it forbade the troubling the minds of the people generally with any of the more subtle questions on the subject.

vi. **The Passages of Scripture** commonly brought forward really bear very little on the doctrine of Purgatory. We learn that there is an intermediate place of safe keeping and waiting between death and judgment, but there is no positive intimation that souls undergo there, amidst material flames, pains, which differ little, save in their temporary character, from the sufferings of the lost. The parable of

[1] See *Vita S. Bonifacii*, *Epist.* xx., ed. Migne.

[2] They discussed the subject with their usual ingenuity, and fully explained the situation of purgatory, its pains, and their intensity.

[3] At this Council there met besides many Italian bishops, the Greek Emperor, John Palæologus, and eighteen Eastern bishops. On their return to Constantinople, the Greek bishops were received with the utmost indignation by those whom they were supposed to represent. The decrees of Florence were absolutely rejected, the Synod was repudiated, and the patriarchs of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria, who were represented by deputies at the Council, protested against it. The Eastern Church has never acknowledged its decrees. Palmer *On the Church*, IV. xi. 5.

[4] The Tridentine Decrees only assert that souls are *detentæ* in Purgatory; in the Tridentine Catechism the Roman Church teaches that they are *cruciatæ*.

[5] "Neque negandum est, defunctorum animas pietate suorum viventium relevari, quum pro illis sacrificium mediatoris offertur, vel eleemosynae in ecclesia fiunt." S. Aug. *Enchir.* § 110.

Dives and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19—31) does indeed teach us that a separation between the evil and the good awaits each one immediately after our departure out of this world in the waiting time between death and the general resurrection, and that the evil and unrepentant have a foretaste of future misery[1], and the good of future bliss. But there is no hint that the soul of Dives was numbered among the faithful, for whom the Purgatorial pains are regarded as available. Again when S. Paul declares that *every man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is* (1 Cor. iii. 12—15), it is difficult to see what else he can be referring to, except *the day of judgment* at the end of the world[2]. He is plainly making no allusion to the Intermediate State. When, moreover, he prays for Onesiphorus that he *may find mercy of the Lord in the day*[3] (2 Tim. i. 16, 18), there

[1] Ἐν βασάνοις. Originally the word is applied to the test or touchstone of metals. Here the nature of the torments is suggested by the "flame" of the next verse, but that word does not necessarily imply the material element of fire. Rather it seems to indicate for the soul of the evil doer, when brought face to face with that holiness of God which is as a "consuming fire" (Heb. xii. 29), an anguish as intolerable as the touch of earthly flame is to the nerves of the mortal body. Compare Newman's *Dream of Gerontius*:—

"And these two pains, so counter and so keen,—
The longing for Him, when thou seest Him not,
The shame of self at thought of seeing Him—
Will be thy veriest, sharpest purgatory."

"The torment, especially of thirst, of the wicked, is repeatedly mentioned in Jewish writings. Thus, in one place, the fable of *Tantalus* is apparently repeated (Jer. Chag. 77. d). The righteous is seen beside delicious springs, and the wicked with his tongue parched at the brink of a river, the waves of which are constantly receding from him." Edersheim *Life and Times of Jesus*, ii., p. 281. Respecting the material flame and the burning tongue, "we may," writes Abp. Trench, "safely say that the form in which the sense of pain, with the desire after alleviation, embodies itself, is figurative." Trench *On the Parables*, p. 471 note, Ed. 1847.

[2] That the Apostle is referring to the fire of the Great Day is evident from the context, and from such passages as 2 Thess. i. 7, "The revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of His power *in flaming fire*." Comp. also Heb. x. 27; xii. 29; 2 Pet. iii. 7.

[3] Comp. 2 Cor. v. 6, ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου.

is nothing which implies, supposing Onesiphorus had departed this life, that he was in Purgatory, and that the Apostle's prayers might help to mitigate his pains. If we turn to the Apostle's own language, and consider his statement on the subject of his own dissolution, we do not find anything that bears out such a doctrine. When he speaks of departing this life himself, it is *to be with Christ*[1] (Phil. i. 23), to be, that is, in His immediate presence and keeping. S. John, again, tells us how he heard a Voice from heaven, saying, Write, *Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth; yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours*[2] (Rev. xiv. 13). We may perhaps believe that the Intermediate State in the case of those, who have departed this life in God's holy fear, is a state of purification[3] and preparation for the Beatific Vision and the life of heaven, and that many, whose conversion here is maimed and imperfect, may by purgation ripen to such a degree of perfection as they are capable of, before they can endure the presence of God. But this is very different from the doctrine that there is for all souls after death a purgatorial fire[4], from the pains of which relief can be obtained by the offering of masses in consideration of payments of money.

[1] Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ must refer to that day, when all judgment will be committed to the Son, John v. 22.

[2] "Joy and rest are given immediately upon death, to all who depart in charity. For presently all become certain of their eternal salvation, which brings great joy. Yet that joy is not given in the same way but diversely, according to diversity of merits. For to some it is given without admixture of dolour, to others, not without admixture of temporal sufferings." Bellarmine *De Purg.*, i. 9.

[3] "This life is far more than a probation; it is an education, a discipline; and this aspect of existence by no means ceases at death. No unfair strain is put upon S. Paul's language by supposing that he distinctly contemplated a progressive work of grace in the soul between death and judgment. *I am confident*, he writes, *of this very thing that He, who began in you a good work, will accomplish it until the day of Jesus Christ* (Phil. i. 6)....We may hope that many, in whom conversion was very imperfect here, will then be ripened to such a degree of perfection as they are found capable of." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 376, 2nd ed.

[4] The expression that the doctrine of Purgatory "is a fond thing vainly invented" must far less apply to the

vii. **Pardons.** Prayers and Masses for the dead, at first a mercy and consolation, became in time a trade and an inexhaustible source of wealth. Later still Pardons or Indulgences[1], originally the remission of Ecclesiastical Censures, and granted by Bishops and afterwards by Provincial Councils[2], became extended in their significance, and were understood to effect the remission of years, sometimes of centuries, of Purgatory. In process of time Indulgences were still further extended to liberal almsgiving, pilgrimages, and taking part in holy wars like the Crusades. The sale of them reached its greatest height in the Pontificate of Leo X., when Tetzel, the agent of that Pope[3], openly sold

mere doctrine than to the mass of flagrant abuses with which it became identified. The primitive doctrine of a place of purification is not condemned by the Article. It is noticeable that the Article does not formulate the doctrine which it condemns. Gregory of Nazianzus speaks of the "benignant, the philanthropic fire worthy of Him who chastises (κολάζοντος), by which men are to be purified from evil." *Orat.* xl. 6. "As no soul leaves this present existence in a fully complete and prepared state, we must suppose that there is an intermediate state, a realm of progressive development in which souls are prepared and matured for the final judgment. The Roman doctrine...contains the truth that the intermediate state must, in a purely spiritual sense, be a Purgatory designed for the purifying of the soul." Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 457, E. T. Compare the words of Butler, *Anal.* ii. 5, "It cannot, I suppose, be imagined, even by the most cursory reader, that it is in any sort affirmed or implied in anything said in this chapter, that none can have the benefit of the general redemption, but such as have the advantage of being made acquainted with it *in this present life*." See also Dorner, *System of Christian Doctrine*, iv. pp. 409, 410, E. T.

[1] *Indulgentia* in Classical Latin was a Roman law-term, and meant *remission of* (i) *punishment* or (ii) *taxation* on the occasion of the accession of a new emperor or of the birth of an imperial or royal prince. As an ecclesiastical expression it denoted (i) *the remission of sins*, (ii) *the lightening of ecclesiastical penalties*. The question of such relaxation first came up in the case of those who had lapsed during the Decian persecution, and for whom martyrs interceded.

[2] As Provincial Councils frequently referred such matters to the See of Rome, that See gradually claimed and exercised a dispensing power independent of Councils, and the Bishop of Rome was held to have a storehouse of merits of Christ and of the Saints, which he could dispense, either by himself or his agents, to mitigate or shorten the sufferings of penitents, whether in this world or the world to come. See Article "Indulgence" in Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiq.* i. p. 834.

[3] To call such sales "a fond thing vainly invented,.....repugnant to the Word of God" is a mild censure compared with Gardiner's words, who describes them as "the devil's craft." See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, 411, ed. 1890. "At the close of the xiiith cen-

them throughout Germany, and by so doing precipitated the Teutonic revolt. The idea that the temporal penalties for sin in the Intermediate State can be remitted by a money payment did untold harm, as Chaucer and other writers[1] testify, and gave rise to the saying of our forefathers, "No penny, no Paternoster." Long before the sixteenth century this abuse had rankled in the heart of Christendom. The reforming Councils, however, had no power to stem the increasing corruption, and owing to the expensive tastes of the Roman Curia demanding more and more money, a doctrine, "which had its roots in primitive antiquity, was preached in a way to destroy all Christian morality[2]."

viii. **The Teaching of Scripture.** The doctrine of Pardons or Indulgences rests on the doctrine that the merits of the Saints, over and above what were needed for their own salvation, technically called "works of supererogation," constitute an inexhaustible treasury, on which the Pope has a right to draw and apply to the release of souls

tury, the fervent Franciscan preacher, Berthold, called the 'Penny Preachers,' 'favourite servants of the devil,' and said that they 'crowned the devil daily with many thousand souls.'" Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 354.

[1] In the vision of Piers Ploughman we read

"There preched a Pardonere; as he a prest were,
Brouȝt forth a bulle; with bishopes seles,
And seide þat hymself myȝte assoilen hem alle,
Of falshed, of fastyng, of vowes y-broken."

The poem ends with a peroration on the small value of the Pope's pardons, and the superiority of a righteous life over mere trust in indulgences at the last Great Day. See Skeat's Edition, *Clarendon Press*, p. xxx.

[2] The Roman Catholic princes of Germany, alarmed at the progress of Lutheranism, met in Diet at Nuremberg in 1522, and addressed a petition to Pope Hadrian VI. for the remedy of a "Hundred Grievances of the German Nation," which they set forth in that document. Amongst these occur, No. 5, "How license to sin with impunity is granted for money"; No. 67, "How more money than penitence is exacted from sinners." "What wickedness," the princes ask, "will mortals shudder at any longer, when they have once persuaded themselves that license and impunity for sinning can be had for money, however extravagant the sum, not only in this life but after death also, by means of these marketings of Indulgences?" See Brown's *Fasciculus Rerum*, London, 1690, i. pp. 334—393; also Milman's *Latin Christianity*, ix. p. 343; Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 353.

in Purgatory, so that anyone, who obtains an Indulgence, can apply its merits to himself or transfer it to some other, living or dead. But we have already seen that none of the Saints were free from the stain of Original Sin, and so could not perform works of superabundant merit. When S. Paul says to his Corinthian converts that he *will most gladly spend and be spent for their souls* (2 Cor. xii. 15); when he tells the Colossians that he *rejoices in his sufferings for their sake, and fills up on his part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in his flesh for His body's sake, which is the Church* (Col. i. 24); whatever else he means, it seems indeed a straining of words to believe that he intended us to understand that he was adding to an infinite store of merits, which could be applied for the deliverance of souls. The merits of Christ, it is allowed, are *infinite,* and therefore the merits of all the Saints together[1] which at best are *finite,* cannot make His merits greater or more efficient.

ix. **The Worshipping and Adoration of Images and Relics.** In the Primitive Church the feeling against the adoration of

(*a*) *Images* was very strong. The Jewish Christians were naturally imbued with a horror of them, and many of the early Fathers speak, like

[1] Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία, Col. i. 24. "Romanist commentators," remarks Bp Lightfoot, "have found in this passage an assertion of the merits of the saints, and (as a necessary consequence) of the doctrine of Indulgences. They have not observed that if the idea of vicarious satisfaction comes into the passage at all, the satisfaction of S. Paul is represented here as the same in kind with the satisfaction of Christ, however different it may be in degree; and thus they have truly exposed themselves to the reproach which Estius indignantly repudiates on their behalf, 'quasi Christus non satis passus sit ad redemptionem nostram, ideoque supplemento martyrum opus habeat; quod impium est sentire, quodque Catholicos dicere impie calumniantur hæretici'." See Lightfoot's *Commentary on Col., in loc.*, p. 233. "So far as regards this particular passage, the Roman doctrine can only be imported into it at the cost of a contradiction to the Pauline doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ." See Bp Lightfoot's *Comm. in loc.*

Clement of Alexandria[1], of "the impropriety of making an image of God, the best image of whom is man created after His likeness." The sign, indeed, of the Cross was constantly made by Christians on their foreheads, at their going out and coming in, at meals, at the baths, at lying down and rising up[2]. But, as Minucius Felix says, they "neither worshipped crosses nor wished to do so[3]." In the fourth and fifth centuries, however, a tendency to pay reverence to images began to appear in some quarters, and they gradually found admittance into the Churches. In the eighth century the famous Iconoclastic controversy arose, and continued for many years, till a Council summoned at Constantinople, A.D. 754, condemned all worship and use of images[4]. But these decrees were reversed by the Second Council of Nice, summoned by the Empress Irene, A.D. 784, which enacted that images might be set up, salutations and honour paid to them, and incense offered, but not the worship of *Latreia*, which was due to God alone. As the Middle Ages advanced, carved representations began to be set up, which were supposed to be possessed of miraculous powers for the cure of diseases. It is these images, which the framers of the Articles had before their eyes in England. Such was the Crucifix at Boxley in Kent[5],

[1] Clem. Alex. *Stromat.* v. 5; vi. 18; vii. 5. So Minucius Felix asks, "Why should I form an image of God, when, if you think rightly, man is himself God's image?" Min. Felix, *Octavius*, cap. xix.

[2] Tertull. *De Cor. Mil.* c. iii.; *Ad Uxor.* ii. 5.

[3] Min. Felix, *Octav.* c. ix.

[4] See Smith, *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. p. 818.

[5] Such again was the huge image of wood, called Darvel Gatheren, in Wales, to which pilgrims, several hun-

which was said at times to stir and shake its head, to bow and lift up itself, and to do other things which were deemed miraculous[1].

(*b*) *Relics.*

In the early ages of the Church there was a marked inclination to pay much respect to the remains of martyrs[2]. While it was regarded as a privilege by the early Christians to save their bodies after their passion, to collect and preserve their bones, they indignantly repudiated the idea of worshipping them. But the practice, when pushed to an extreme, began to foster superstition[3], and S. Augustine complains of the custom, then beginning, of people wandering about his Diocese, and selling relics[4], or what they reported to be relics, of those who had suffered martyrdom. During the Middle Ages, and especially after the Crusades, relic-worship reached its highest point. The con-

dreds in number, brought oxen and cattle and money; a huge image of our Lady at Worcester; an image of our Lady with a taper in her hands at S. David's, "which was believed to have burnt nine years, till one forswearing himself upon it, it went out; and was then much reverenced and worshipped." Burnet's *Hist. Ref.* i. 488.

[1] See Burnet's *History of the Reformation* i. p. 486; the Homily on the *Peril of Idolatry*, pp. 219—222.

[2] See the *Martyr. Polycarpi*, c. 17. Such due honour is indeed inseparable from an adequate realization of the fact of the Incarnation. Comp. Pater, *Marius the Epicurean*, ii. p. 153. Ed. 1885.

[3] "There is, however, no trace of a superstitious value being attached to relics before the conversion of the Emperors, under whom multitudes of proselytes entered the Church, who had only partially renounced heathenism." Smith's *Dict. Christian Ant.* ii. 1769.

[4] "Alii membra martyrum, si tamen martyrum, venditant." S. Aug. *de Op. Monach.* c. 28. The sale of them was forbidden by Theodosius, but apparently with little effect in the more distant provinces. "Humatum corpus nemo ad alterum locum transferat, nemo martyrem detrahat, nemo mercetur." *Codex* ix. 17, 7. "Gregory the Great reproved the Greek practice of irreverently disinterring and sending about the bodies of Saints; he refused to the Emperor of Constantinople relics of S. Paul." Milman's *Lat. Christ.* ix. 85.

quest of Jerusalem poured upon Europe a countless supply of sacred objects. A splinter of the true Cross, some memorial of the Virgin-Mother and her Son, the bone of an Apostle, filings from the chains of S. Peter or S. Paul, became the most precious treasures of the most beautiful Churches, and were regarded as possessing the power of working miracles.

x. **The teaching of the Scriptures** as regards Images and Relics may be thus summarised.

(i) *Images.*

The Jews, as we all know, were solemnly warned against any approach to idolatry, but they were instructed to place emblematical figures in the Tabernacle and the Temple, e.g. the Cherubim on each side of the Mercy-Seat (Ex. xxv. 18), the oxen, lions, and Cherubim round the Molten Sea (1 Kings vii. 23, 25). The idea, however, of worshipping these figures never occurred to them. It is true, again, that when Moses set up the brazen serpent in the wilderness the wounded Israelites were taught to look up to it for healing and deliverance (Numb. xxi. 8, 9), but when the people were tempted to worship it, Hezekiah, in spite of all its venerable associations, broke it in pieces (2 Kings xviii. 4). Jeroboam, indeed, might have pleaded that the golden calves he set up at Dan and Bethel were merely intended as symbols of the power of Jehovah, but this did not make his act other than idolatrous, and he is ever described as the man who *made Israel to sin* (1 Kings xii. 28). It is no wonder, therefore, that in the face of these facts the leaders of the new Movement in the Sixteenth Century regarded figures supposed to be possessed of miraculous powers with extreme disfavour, and viewed with suspicion the distinctions drawn between the

kinds of worship, which might or might not be addressed to them.

(ii) *Relics.*

In extenuation of relic-worship it is pleaded that miracles were wrought by the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21), by touching the hem of Christ's garment (Matt. ix. 20—22), by the shadow of Peter passing through the streets of Jerusalem (Acts v. 15), by handkerchiefs and aprons brought from the body of S. Paul (Acts xix. 12). But we have no instance in Scripture of the bones or garments of the Saints being preserved for the express purpose of adoration or as instruments of miraculous cures. We do not find that this was done in the case of the body of S. Stephen (Acts viii. 2), or S. James (Acts xii. 2), or in the case of the linen brought from the body of S. Paul (Acts xix. 12). In the earliest ages of the Church, no undue honour was paid to the relics even of the most holy of men. As we have seen, the contemporaries of S. Polycarp indignantly denied that they wished for his body with a view to any superstitious purpose[1], and S. Augustine severely reproved the sale of relics, which in his day had grown into an abuse.

xi. **The Invocation of Saints.** Prayers for the departed have entered into the ritual of every Jewish synagogue from the earliest times, and there is no question that this custom prevailed early amongst the primitive Christians. They had a lively conviction that the saints departed were still fellow-worshippers with the Church militant here on earth, and were in close communion with its members[2], that "between the living and the dead in Christ there is a vital bond of union and joint participation

[1] *Martyr. Polycarpi*, c. 17.
[2] Compare Phil. iii. 20; Eph. ii. 19; Heb. xii. 22, 23.

of privilege and responsibility[1]." In the course of time the affectionate interest of the early Christians in the state of those who had gone behind the veil, and their belief that they still prayed with them and for them, fostered the inclination to ask the departed to offer prayers for them, and so by degrees the worship of the saints became more and more common. Eventually throughout the length and breadth of Christendom every community and every individual[2] had an intercessor with the great Intercessor between God and man, some intermediate being, whose office and duty it was to speed the suppliant's prayer and, having put off the fetters of the flesh, to plead with greater avail on his behalf[3]. Thus it came to pass that the cultus of the Blessed Virgin and the Saints reached a height which seemed to overshadow the worship due to Christ Himself, and it was laid down in the decrees of the Council of Trent that "the Saints reigning together with Christ offer their prayers for men to God, and that it is good and useful to invoke them as suppliants, and, for the sake of obtaining benefits from God through our Lord Jesus Christ, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour, to have recourse to their prayers, aid, and assistance[4]."

xii. **Teaching of the Scriptures.** The Invocation, then, rebuked in the Article is that kind of Invocation which trenches on the incommunicable honour due to God alone[5]. This rebuke Scripture sanctions. For in the New

[1] Luckock's *Intermediate State*, p. 235. Thus Origen writes, "Ego sic arbitror, quod omnes illi, qui dormierunt ante nos, patres pugnent nobiscum, et adjuvent nos orationibus suis." *In Jesum Nave*, Hom. xvi. 5.

[2] The fact that when Constantine adopted the Christian Faith, multitudes joined the Church, who were just emerging from a state of heathenism, which had all along worshipped deified mortals, told sensibly in the direction of adoration of Saints departed. See Bp Forbes, *Articles*, pp. 380, 381.

[3] See Milman's *Latin Christianity*, ix. p. 83.

[4] Conc. Trident. *Sessio* xxv.

[5] In one of his Sermons Hooker says, "Against invocation of any other than God alone, if all arguments else should fail, the number whereof is both great and forcible, yet this very bar and

Testament we have two instances of adoration offered to Angels (Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 8, 9), and two offered to Apostles (Acts x. 25, 26; xiii. 14), and each time it is refused. It is quite true that subtle distinctions can be drawn between *degrees* of worship, and it may be said that, while divine honours are paid to God, only secondary worship is offered to the Saints. But all history tends to show that in dealing with the ignorant it is not easy to preserve these distinctions, and when S. Paul warns his Colossian converts against the *worshipping of angels* (Col. ii. 18), the Greek word he uses comprehends all kinds of worship[1]. It seems allowable to believe that the Saints in the disembodied state are engaged in ceaseless supplication, and that by an act of faith we may join our supplications with theirs. But there is no Scripture warrant for believing that they have power with God because of their own merits apart from those of our Lord, or that they are kinder and have more sympathy with sinners than Christ our Saviour, who offered Himself for us on the Altar of His Cross. To request the intercession of the Saints is too like the way in which we address Almighty God to be really safe, and trenches dangerously on the office of the Great Intercessor. It seems far best to be guided by the spirit of the

single challenge might suffice; that whereas God hath in Scripture delivered us so many patterns for imitation when we pray, yea, framed ready to our hands in a manner all, for suits and supplications, which our condition of life on earth may at any time need, there is not one, no not one to be found, directed unto angels, saints, or any, saving God alone." Hooker, *Sermons*, vii. 1; *Works*, Vol. ii. p. 793. Ed. 1841.

[1] Θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων. The word θρησκεία includes every kind of worship that can be offered. Primarily it denotes religious worship in its external aspect, a *cultus*: comp. Acts xxvi. 5; Jas. i. 26, 27. "It is noticeable that the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 394), so near Colossæ, forbids (c. 35) Christians to leave the Church and go away 'to name angels' in secret assemblies, calling this a 'secret idolatry.' Theodoret in his Commentary here speaks of the existence in his time (Cent. v) of oratories (*euctêria*) to the Archangel Michael in the region of Laodicea and Colossæ, and of their popularity, apparently as rivals to the regular Churches." *The Cambridge Bible, in loc.*

Prayer Book, which in the Collect for All Saints Day bids us, instead of invoking their aid[1], pray for grace to imitate their good examples, and follow in the steps of their most holy lives[2].

[1] The evidence of the Latin Sacramentaries, the source of so many of our Prayer-Book Collects, goes to prove that certainly in the fifth century, probably earlier, frequent commemoration was made of the *interventus*, *opitulatio*, *preces*, *suffragium*, even *peculiare præsidium* of the Saints. These expressions, however, are found in such connection with certain others, e.g. *veneranda confessio*, *robur*, *patientia*, as to show that, ultimately, the principle underlying the practice is that *solidarité* of the Σῶμα Χριστοῦ to which St Paul refers in 1 Cor. xii. 20 sqq. Comp. Neale and Forbes, *Gallican Liturgies*, Pt 1. Ed. 1855.

[2] As regards the Invocation of Saints Launcelot Andrewes agrees with Origen *in Epist. ad Rom.* lib. ii. that our relations to the saints are among "the hidden things of God" ("inter occulta Dei, nec chartulæ committenda mysteria"). "That they intercede for us," he says, "is probable; a pious and well-founded hope. That they *hear* prayers is not proved. We cannot invoke them, because we have no command warranting us to do so," ("eos autem haud libenter quis compellet, de quibus, qua tandem ratione audiant compellantem, et proinde audiant necne, certus non sit." *Ad Card. Bellarm. Responsio*, p. 47.

Article XXIII.

1563.

Nemo in Ecclesia ministret nisi uocatus.

Non licet cuiquam sumere sibi munus publicè prædicandi, aut administrandi Sacramenta in Ecclesia, nisi prius fuerit ad hæc obeunda legitimè uocatus et missus. Atque illos, legitimè uocatos et missos existimare debemus, qui per homines, quibus potestas uocandi Ministros atque mittendi in uineam Domini publicè concessa est in Ecclesia, cooptati fuerint et asciti in hoc opus.

1571.

Of ministryng in the congregation.

It is not lawful for any man to take vpon hym the office of publique preachyng, or ministring the Sacramentes in the congregation, before he be lawfully called and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to iudge lawfully called and sent, whiche be chosen and called to this worke by men who haue publique aucthoritie geuen vnto them in the congregation, to call and sende ministers into the Lordes vineyarde.

i. **Connection.** Having dealt with the constitution and authority of the Church, as also with the channels through which the voice of the Church is made known, the Articles proceed to speak of the Ministers of the Church, and to lay down the necessity of their having a definite call and mission. This came out more clearly in the original title of the Article, "Nemo in Ecclesia ministret nisi vocatus," "no man may minister in the congregation, except he be called."

ii. **Source.** The Article is founded on the Fourteenth Article of the Confession of Augsburg[1], which states that "no one ought to preach or administer the Sacraments publicly in Church, who is not rightly called." This expres-

[1] "De Ordine Ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in Ecclesia publice docere, aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus." Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 20.

sion has been adopted in our Article, but the word "ritè," *duly* or *rightly*, has been altered to "legitimè," *lawfully*, and "missus," *sent*, has been added to *called*, so that the sentence now runs, "before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same."

iii. **Object.** As originally drawn up the Article had for its object to controvert the teaching of the Anabaptists, who maintained that anyone, believing himself called to the work of the Ministry, had a right to exercise his functions as a preacher in defiance of all Church-order or authority. Thus we are told that "a bricklayer taking upon him the office of preaching, affirmed he might lawfully do it, though he were not called thereunto by the Church. For *Spiritus ubi vult spirat*[1]."

iv. **Analysis.** The Article contains two propositions:—

(α) That no man may assume the office of the Ministry without a lawful call and mission;

(β) That such calling and mission can only be given by those "who have publick authority given unto them in the Congregation to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard[2]."

Thus it is distinctly laid down that the Church is an organized body, and that it is separated from those aggregates of individuals, to whom Christianity is a so-called "spiritual" matter only. It is true that there is no

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 102 *n.* ed. 1890, quoting Huggard's *Displaying of the Protestantes*, sign. B. iii.

[2] Or as it is expressed in the Fourth of the Eleven Articles of 1559, "It is not lawful for any man to take upon him any office or ministry, either ecclesiastical or secular, but such only as are lawfully thereunto called by their high authorities, according to the ordinances of this realm." In the xiii. Articles of 1538 the xth Article ran: "De Ministris Ecclesiæ docemus, quod nemo debeat publice docere, aut Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus, et quidem ab his, penes quos in Ecclesia, juxta verbum Dei et leges ac consuetudines uniuscujusque regionis, jus est vocandi et admittendi."

definition here either of the nature of Ordination or of the lawful authority essential to call and mission. But this definition is practically supplied by the Ordinal, which really interprets the meaning of the Article, and expresses the mind of its compilers on the subject.

v. **The Principle of Order in the Old Testament.** Respecting the first of these two propositions it is in truth a matter of common sense, which applies not only to Church Order, but to any order in Church or State. If any one may take upon himself the office of a governor at his own will, and exercise the same at his own discretion, the most complete disorder must be the inevitable result. Hence it is not surprising that under the Jewish Law we find the principle of order recognised with the utmost carefulness. The whole nation indeed was regarded as dedicated to God and as constituting His people[1], yet only one tribe was allowed to perform priestly offices before Him, and of that tribe only one family, the family of Aaron, might hold the office of high priest. Any violation of this enactment was severely punished, as in the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Num. xvi.), of Saul when he offered sacrifice at Gilgal instead of waiting for Samuel (1 Sam. xiii), of Uzziah, when he ventured to burn incense in the Sanctuary (2 Chron. xxvi. 16—19).

vi. **In the New Testament,** again, we find our Lord waiting upwards of thirty years in seclusion and retirement before He enters upon His public ministry[2], and He does not enter upon it then till the Holy Spirit has descended upon Him at His Baptism, and He has received His commission from the Father visibly acknowledging Him

[1] Comp. the LXX. of Exodus xix. 6 with the Greek of S. Peter *ὑμεῖς δὲ γένος ἐκλεκτόν, βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* (1 Pet. ii. 9).

[2] Comp. Matt. iii. 13; Mark i. 9; Luke iii. 23.

and saying, *Thou art My beloved Son; in Thee I am well pleased* (Luke iii. 22). Even He *glorified not Himself to be made a High Priest* (Heb. v. 5)[1]. Again, during His Ministry He did not give to every one indiscriminately His commission to preach and to baptize. He Himself after a long night of prayer chose the Apostles (Luke vi. 12, 13), and to their training He devoted all His energies. He Himself also *appointed seventy others, and sent them two and two before His face into every city and place, whither He Himself was about to come* (Luke x. 1). Thus during His life on earth there were three orders[2],

1. Our Lord[3],
2. The Twelve,
3. The Seventy.

vii. **Apostolic Times.** After the Ascension the same principle of order was still recognised by those whom our Lord had left to represent Him[4]. In the Acts and the Epistles we find in existence three orders, (1) the Apostles, (2) Elders, (3) Deacons[5], and in process of time Bishops

[1] Οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, Heb. v. 5. "It is not said that 'Jesus' glorified not Himself, but 'the Christ,' the appointed Redeemer, glorified not Himself....Christ, as sinless man, could approach God for Himself; but He waited for His Father's appointment that He might approach God as Son of Man for sinful humanity." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

[2] Just as under the Mosaic economy there were (1) the High Priest, (2) the Priests, (3) the Levites. "Quod Aaron et filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo, hoc sibi Episcopi, et Presbyteri, et Diaconi, vindicent in Ecclesia." S. Hieron. *Ep.* cxlvi. *ad Evag.*

[3] Our Blessed Lord, the Source of all grace, is the fountain head of the Christian Ministry. In His sacred Person He summed up all the offices of the Ministry. Thus in the New Testament He receives the title of Apostle (Heb. iii. 1); Bishop (1 Pet. ii. 25); Priest (Heb. v. 6); Deacon (Luke xxii. 27).

[4] How truly He intended that they should be His representatives in the world is plain from His own declaration, *He that heareth you heareth Me, and he that rejecteth you rejecteth Me, and he that rejecteth Me rejecteth Him that sent Me*, Luke x. 16.

[5] Acts vi. 1—6. We soon find the diaconate in the Gentile churches also (Rom. xii. 7), and a deaconess, no doubt for the ministrations to the half-secluded women of a Greek town, in the Church at Cenchreæ (Rom. xvi. 1). That the office mentioned in Acts vi.

were chosen out of the general body of Elders for definite localities[1] and special spheres of work, and the three orders were in course of time again reproduced under the names of (1) Bishops, (2) Presbyters, (3) Deacons. Thus from the earliest twilight of the Christian dawn down to the present day the principle of order has been universally recognised, and we can find no trace of persons being allowed at random or on their own initiative to exercise spiritual functions.

viii. **Our Lord's sense of Mission.** The second proposition advanced in the Article is that calling and mission can only be given to the Clergy by those who have public authority in the Church to do so. This principle has been recognised from the beginning. Even Christ, as we have just seen, *glorified not Himself to be made a High Priest* (Heb. v. 5), and again and again we find Him dwelling on the fact of His divine mission as an animating and inspiring power. This sense of mission does not cease even after His Resurrection. When on the evening of the first Easter Day He revisits the Apostles in the upper room, He bids them carry on not a new, but *His* commission. *As the Father hath sent Me*, He says, *even so send I you*[2] (John xx. 21). And just before His

represents the later diaconate is testified by the unanimous voice of tradition from the earliest times. "Irenæus, the first writer who alludes to the appointment of the Seven, distinctly holds them to have been deacons." Iren. i. 26, 3; iii. 12, 10. Bp Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 188.

[1] In promoting the rise of the episcopate, which slept in the Apostolate, the example of the presidency exercised by S. James at Jerusalem must have had great effect in Syria. An early tradition ascribes a special agency in this matter to the Apostle S. John, who is said to have appointed bishops in the Churches of Asia Minor—"Asia Minor was," says Bp Lightfoot, "the nurse, if not the mother, of episcopacy in the Gentile Churches." *Philippians*, p. 206. "S. James, the Lord's brother, clearly enjoyed in Jerusalem the local preeminence and authority (Acts xv. 13; xxi. 18; Gal. i. 19) which justified later writers in calling him *bishop* of Jerusalem; and the Apostolic authority of S. John was probably in his latter days so far localized in Ephesus and its neighbourhood that we may well call him bishop of that city." Cheetham's *Church History*, p. 31.

[2] Καθὼς ἀπέσταλκέ με ὁ Πατήρ, κἀγὼ πέμπω ὑμᾶς. The tense here used has an emphasis of its own. He says not *as the Father sent Me*, as though He was speaking of something past,

Ascension He utters His last command. *All authority hath been given unto Me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost...and lo, I am with you all the days, even unto the end of the world* (Matt. xxviii. 18—20). Thus, then, as the Father *sent* the Son, so the Son Himself *sent* the Apostles.

ix. **The Apostles** also, when the time came, sent and commissioned those who succeeded them. We do not read in the New Testament that either Timothy or Titus derived their authority to act at Ephesus and Crete by delegation from below. As, when the Lord Jesus was on earth, He alone ordained[1], so after His Ascension the Apostles acted as the ministers of Ordination[2]. S. Paul gives to Timothy and Titus their commission. He ordains them (2 Tim. i. 6); he locates the one in the capital of Roman Asia (1 Tim. i. 3); he assigns to the other the island of Crete (Tit. i. 5). In these respective districts he authorises them to execute some of the same functions[3] which he had himself exercised in his own wider sphere of labour. He clothes them with power to ordain (1 Tim. iii. 1—13; Tit. i. 5); to set in order the public services (1 Tim. ii. 1, 2 &c.); to execute discipline (1 Tim. v. 17); to rebuke, exhort, admonish those that erred (2 Tim. iv. 2; Tit. i. 13); and to provide in their turn for a due succession of faithful men in the office of teaching (2 Tim. ii. 2). In one place,

but *as the Father hath sent Me.* He speaks of His Mission as a thing still present. He is ὁ Ἀπόστολος. They are ἀπόστολοι. This title is ascribed to Him in Heb. iii. 1: Κατανοήσατε τὸν Ἀπόστολον καὶ Ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, *Consider Him who occupies the double position of envoy from God and High Priest.* In Christ the functions of Moses and Aaron are combined, each in an infinitely loftier form. See Bp Westcott, *in loc.*

[1] See Matt. x; Luke x; John xx. 21.

[2] Except in the case of S. Matthias and S. Paul, who were called to the Apostleship by Christ Himself.

[3] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* vii. 6. 3.

indeed, S. Paul specially reminds Timothy how grace for the Ministry had been given him[1] by the laying on of Apostolic hands (2 Tim. i. 6)[2].

x. **Sub-Apostolic times.** When we pass from Apostolic to Sub-Apostolic times we find that within the lifetime of those who had learned from the Apostles in person, it had come to be recognised that no Church could be complete without the Three Orders of the Ministry. "The Apostles," writes Clemens Romanus, "received the Gospel[3] for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent forth from God. So then Christ is from God, and the Apostles are from Christ. Both therefore came of the will of God in the appointed order. Having therefore received a charge they went forth,...and preaching everywhere in country and town they appointed their firstfruits, when they had proved them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons unto them that should believe[4]." "Give ye heed to the Bishop," writes Ignatius, "that God also

[1] "With less permanence but perhaps greater authority, the position occupied by these Apostolic delegates fairly represents the functions of the bishop early in the second century. They were in fact the link between the Apostle whose superintendence was occasional and general, and the bishop who exercised a permanent supervision over an individual congregation." Bp Lightfoot's *Philippians*, p. 199.

[2] The Apostles had, however, received no power from Christ to confer the Apostolate upon others; the vocation and bestowal came direct from God. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. pp. 91 sqq.: Eng. ed. 1877.

[3] "Though the New Testament itself contains as yet no direct and indisputable notices of a localized episcopate in the Gentile Churches, as distinguished from the moveable episcopate exercised by Timothy in Ephesus, and by Titus in Crete, yet there is satisfactory evidence of its development in the later years of the Apostolic age,...and that in the early years of the second century the episcopate was widely spread and had taken firm root, more especially in Asia Minor and Syria. If the evidence on which its extension in the regions East of the Ægean at this period be resisted, I am at a loss to understand what single fact relating to the history of the Christian Church during the first half of the second century can be regarded as established; for the testimony in favour of this spread of the episcopate is more abundant and more varied than for any other institution or event during this period, so far as I can recollect." Bp Lightfoot's *Epistles of S. Ignatius*, i. pp. 376, 377.

[4] Clem. Rom. 1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. 42. Bp Lightfoot's translation.

may give heed to you. I am devoted to those who are subject to the Bishop, the Presbyters, the Deacons. May it be granted to me to have my portion with them in the presence of God[1]." Irenæus speaks distinctly of successions of presbyters in the Church from the time of the Apostles, and recounts the succession of Bishops at Rome from S. Peter and S. Paul, and at Smyrna from S. Polycarp[2]. Tertullian enumerates together the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, and asserts that the two latter could baptize, but not without the authority of the Bishop[3]. From the time of Origen the distinction of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons admits of no question, and it may be regarded as certain that in the earliest ages, in every quarter of the world whither the Church had penetrated, in every city there was one chief Presbyter, presiding over the Clergy of that city and its suburb (*παροικία*), and that to him was committed the power of Ordination, or, in the language of the Article, he had "publick authority given unto him in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard[4]."

xi. **View of the English Church.** In the English Church it has ever been held that the Bishop is the proper Minister of Ordination, and this primitive rule has never been infringed. In the *Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man*, put forth A.D. 1543, we find the

[1] Ignatius, *ad Polyc.* c. 6. The *Shepherd* of Hermas describes as the squared stones of the great building "apostles, and bishops, and teachers, and deacons." *Visio* iii. 5.

[2] Irenæus, *adv. Hær.* iii. 2. In another place he says, "Habemus adnumerare eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos." *Adv. Hær.* iii. 3.

[3] "Dandi (baptismum) quidem habet jus summus Sacerdos, qui est Episcopus, dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine Episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem." Tertull. *de Baptismo*, c. 17.

[4] Bishop Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 555. The expression "the Congregation" here used is equivalent to "the Church," as is clear from the Latin of the Article, where it is translated by "Ecclesia."

strongest language used concerning "Order" as "the gift or grace of Ministration in Christ's Church, given of God to Christian men by the consecration and imposition of the bishop's hands, and concerning a continual succession even to the end of the world." In the *Catechism* he put forth in A.D. 1548 Cranmer dwells strongly on Episcopal Ordination and the Power of the Keys. The *Ordinal* appeared in 1549, and in it it is declared that "from the Apostles' times, there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; to which none were admitted but "by Public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands[1]." This Ordinal is expressly sanctioned and authorized not only as part of the Book of Common Prayer, but also by the xxxvith Article, and the Preface to it not only enjoins Episcopal Ordination, but lays it down that the offices of Bishop, Priest, and Deacon were "evermore had in such reverent estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same[2]."

[1] The *Reformatio Legum*, published in 1552, claims for the three Orders Scriptural authority and Divine appointment, and for bishops the power of jurisdiction and ordination.

[2] "I had the privilege of spending some days with Bishop Lightfoot at Auckland Castle shortly before his death, and he then told me that the study of the early records of Christianity had left no doubt whatever in his mind as to the Apostolic—which, in fact, meant the Divine—origin of Episcopacy, although with that large charity and gentleness which characterized him, he would not presume to pass any judgment on Christian communities differently organized. 'To their own Master,' he said, 'they stand or fall. He knows what allowance to make for a multitude of things which are hidden from me. Our plain duty is to guard faithfully what has been committed to us, and leave others to Him who judgeth righteously'." Canon MacColl, *Preface to Christianity in relation to Science and Morals*, pp. xxxvi, xxxvii.

Article XXIV.

1563.	1571.
Agendum est in Ecclesia lingua quæ sit populo nota.	*Of speaking in the congregation, in such a tongue as the people vnderstandeth.*
Lingua populo non intellecta publicas in ecclesia preces peragere, aut Sacramenta administrare, verbo Dei et primitiuæ Ecclesiæ consuetudini planè repugnat.	It is a thing playnely repugnaunt to the worde of God, and the custome of the primitiue Churche, to haue publique prayer in the Churche, or to minister the Sacramentes in a tongue not vnderstanded of the people.

i. **Connection.** This Article naturally succeeds the preceding, for if the Ministers of the Church must be duly authorized and called, the next natural enquiry is, In what language ought they to officiate?

ii. **Object of the Article.** To this question the Mediævalists replied, that the Latin tongue is the proper vehicle for public worship. It is this position which it is the object of the Article to controvert, and it affirms that the language used in the performance of divine worship should always be intelligible to the people[1].

iii. **The Wording** of the Article has undergone considerable modification since the issue of the first draft in 1553. It then began, "It is most seemly, and most agreeable to the word of God, that in the congregation nothing be openly read, or spoken in a tongue unknown to the

[1] See Hardwick, *Articles*, pp. 104, 130. Ed. 1859.

people[1]." In 1563 this clause was made much stronger, and in place of the words, "It is most seemly," we have substituted, "It is a thing playnely repugnaunt to the worde of God, and the custome of the primitiue Churche, to haue publique prayer in the Churche, or to minister the Sacramentes in a tongue not vnderstanded of the people." The alteration may have been due to a knowledge of what was going on in the Council of Trent, which maintained the Latin language as the ordinary vehicle of worship, and affirmed that "it had not seemed expedient to the Fathers that the Mass should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue[2]."

iv. **Analysis.** The Article affirms that such a mode of conducting public worship is repugnant

(α) to the Word of God,

(β) and the custom of the Primitive Church.

v. **Holy Scripture.** The idea of approaching God in worship in a tongue unknown to the worshippers is quite foreign to the entire tenor of the Old Testament, while in the New Testament we have four points clearly brought out:—

(1) We have no trace of any custom on the part of our Lord of praying Himself or of teaching His Apostles to pray, or of speaking to those of His generation, in an unknown language;

[1] "Decentissimum est et Verbo Dei maxime congruit, ut nihil in Ecclesia publice legatur aut recitetur lingua populo ignota." And it proceeds to allude to the dictum of S. Paul on the subject, "Idque Paulus fieri vetuit, nisi adesset qui interpretaretur."

[2] Twenty-Second Session of the Council, Sep. 17, 1562. Chapter viii. "Etsi missa magnam contineat populi fidelis eruditionem, non tamen expedire visum est Patribus, ut vulgari *passim* lingua celebraretur." Comp. De Sacrificio Missae, Can. ix. "Si quis dixerit...lingua *tantum* vulgari missam celebrari debere.....anathema sit." The italicised words suggest that the Council contemplated the possibility of exception to the rule.

(2) At least one object of the miracle of the Day of Pentecost[1] was to enable the Apostles gifted with divers languages to preach the Gospel to all nations (Acts ii. 4);

(3) S. Paul, when he speaks of the exercise of the gift of tongues by the Corinthian Christians, thanks God that he *speaks with tongues more than all of them. Howbeit*[2] *in Church*, he declares, *he would rather speak five words with his understanding, that he might instruct*[3] *others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue* (1 Cor. xiv. 18, 19);

(4) Moreover in the same chapter he says, *If thou bless with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the unlearned*[4] *say the Amen at thy giving of thanks*[5], *seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest? For thou givest thanks well, but the other*[6] *is not edified* (1 Cor. xiv. 16, 17).

[1] See the Proper Preface in the Communion Office for Whit-Sunday.

[2] Ἀλλ' *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*. Ἀλλὰ here has its full adversative force and specifies what, in spite of the statement in the foregoing verse, was the real feeling of the Apostle on the subject. Ἐν *ἐκκλησίᾳ*, without the article, "may be understood as implying what our more familiar 'in church' would convey to a modern reader." Bp Ellicott on 1 Cor. xiv. 18.

[3] Ἵνα *καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω*. The verb from the nature of the context retains here some tinge of its more restricted meaning "voce instituo," Beza.

[4] Τοῦ *ἰδιώτου*, 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Ἰδιώτης and its use are copiously illustrated by Wetstein. The word denotes (1) a private person as opposed to one in office, or in a profession, *a layman*, as in Acts iv. 13, *ἀγράμματοί εἰσι καὶ ἰδιῶται*, or (2) an unlearned and ignorant person.

[5] The reference here to *τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ*, "the giving of thanks," and to the "Amen," tends to show that the Apostle, as Bp Wordsworth says, is speaking here of the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist. He points to the necessity of its being celebrated in the vulgar tongue, that the people may know when and how to make the proper responses. See the admission of Cardinal Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* I. v. 4.

[6] Σὺ *μὲν γὰρ καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς*. The emphasis rests on the prominently placed pronoun. "*Thou* givest thanks well; he, however, who fills the place of the unlearned is in no degree the better for it."

vi. **The Custom of the Primitive Church.** As regards primitive usage it is to be borne in mind that

(α) It had nowhere been laid down before the Advent of our Lord that Hebrew was too sacred a language for translation into the vernacular tongue;

(β) The Old Testament Scriptures had already been translated into Chaldee for the Palestinian Jews, and into Greek for those of Alexandria and of the Roman world generally;

(γ) And as it was with the Old, so it was with the New Testament. In very early times portions of the New Testament appeared in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Gothic and other languages[1];

(δ) What was true with respect to the Scriptures was true also of the primitive Liturgies. The custom was that the whole congregation should join in the responses and in the singing of the Psalms and Hymns, which would have been impossible, had not the Psalms and Hymns been sung in intelligible dialects capable of being understood by the people[2].

vii. **Testimony of the Fathers.** When we turn to the statements of the early Fathers, we find:—

(α) S. Cyril[3] writing thus, "When the Priest says, *Lift up your hearts*, the people answer, *We lift*

[1] See Article *Versions* in Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible*; Westcott's *Bible in the Church*, and *Canon of the New Testament*.

[2] Martene admits that the proscription of the vernacular in the Mass was not the custom in the beginning. He quotes in confirmation the "story, told by S. Athanasius, of S. Anthony, the Abbot, who, knowing nothing but the Egyptian language, entered a Church, and hearing the Gospel read, in which it is enjoined to sell all, straightway went and did so." Bp Forbes, *Articles*, p. 433.

[3] S. Cyril, *Catech. Mystagog.* v.

them up unto the Lord; when the Priest says, *Let us give thanks unto the Lord,* the people respond, *It is meet and right so to do;*

(*b*) Origen writes, "The Greeks use Greek in their prayers, the Romans Latin, and so every one in his own language prays to God, and gives thanks as he is able. And He that is Lord of every tongue hears that which is asked in every tongue[1];"

(*c*) S. Jerome tells us that at the funeral of Paula, a lady of high rank, "the Psalms were sung in Greek, Latin, and Syriac, because people speaking each of these languages were present[2];"

(*d*) S. Hilary speaks of people standing without the Church, and yet "able to hear the voice of the people praying within; to discern the clear sound of the hymns; and, amidst the celebration of the divine Sacraments, to distinguish the response of devout confession[3]."

Now all this would have been impossible, if the language used had not been intelligible to the people, and had it not been desired that the mass of the faithful should be able to attend to, and understand, the service at which they were present.

viii. **The use of the Latin tongue** in the services of the Western Church was not due to the fact that Latin was the original language of the Roman Church, for that Church in the earliest times used the Greek language, and not only S. Paul's Epistles to and from Rome were written

[1] Origen, *contr. Celsum*, viii. 37.

[2] Hieron. *ad Eustochium, Epitaphium Paulæ Matris*, iv. 2, p. 687.

[3] "Audiat orantis populi consistens quis extra ecclesiam vocem; spectet celebres hymnorum sonitus; et inter divinorum quoque sacramentorum officia, responsionem devotæ confessionis accipiat." Hilar. *in Psalm.* lxv.

in Greek, but all the extant Christian writings of the first three centuries, which appeared in Rome and in the West, were Greek or originally Greek[1]. Moreover in the Roman Mass itself there are still preserved indications of its Greek original. The words *Kyrie Eleison* are Greek, not Latin, and their occurrence in the Mass shows that it was once said in Greek. In process of time, however, Greek began to fall into disuse, and the translation of the divine offices into Latin was made for the very purpose of their being understood by the worshippers, and with the intention of obeying S. Paul's precept. Thus Latin became in its turn the language of Liturgical worship as Greek had been before, and while out of the ancient Latin grew the French, the Italian, the Spanish and other dialects, the Latin Liturgies were retained[2], and gradually acquired, or were supposed to acquire, a special sanctity, and it was deemed profanation to celebrate the Mass in any other language than that of the capital of Christendom. The Eastern Church, on the other hand, did not take this exclusive line. It freely allowed the translation of the Liturgies and other Service Books, for the use of the Slavonic races[3], whom it

[1] "For some considerable part of the first three centuries the Church of Rome, and most, if not all the Churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek; their Scriptures Greek; and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual and their Liturgy was Greek." Milman's *Latin Christianity*, i. p. 32. "The Epistles of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies, the works of Justin Martyr, down to Caius and Hippolytus, the author of the Refutation of all Heresies—all were Greek." Ibid. p. 33.

[2] "As the fresh tribes from the North were evangelized by the Roman clergy, it was natural that the Roman clergy should employ and recommend the rites to which they had been accustomed. It became the measure of the solidity of the conversion that the Latin tongue was accepted. It was also a great means for the consolidation of the Church's power. Even in the Celtic tribes of Ireland and Scotland the Mass, though not the rubrics and hymns, was always in Latin; and whatever may have been the polity and nationality of the race who first raised to heaven the prayers of the Mozarabic Rite, that glorious formulary speaks to God in the language of the Romans." See Bp Forbes, p. 435.

[3] The great Slav races, who received their knowledge of Christ from the East, were freely allowed their

won over to the faith[1]. Hence we can understand why, when the Council of Trent took the course it did[2], the language of the present Article was made stronger and more definite, for the craving in the sixteenth century to possess a vernacular Liturgy was only a craving for what had been sanctioned in the earliest and purest ages of the Church, and in the Greek Church from the first moment of its existence.

Slavonic services. The Armenians and Georgians, Copts and Syrians, were all allowed to worship God in a tongue which they understood.

[1] When in the ninth century the Slavs were converted to the Christian faith by Methodius, Pope John VIII. highly praised their performing the service in the Slavonic tongue. He, however, added that, for the honour of divine worship, the Gospel is to be read first in Latin and then translated into the vernacular. The scruples of this Pontiff are said to have been removed by his remembering the verse in the Psalms, *Praise the Lord all ye nations*. This verse appeared to him decisive. It could hardly mean that the Creator's praise was to be restricted to three languages, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Maclear's *Mediæval Missions*, p. 286.

[2] Comp. p. 289, *n*. It is clearly desirable that, "due precaution being taken for the conservation of the true doctrine by certain unalterable formulæ, the language of prayer and praise should be that which every ordinarily educated person of average intelligence should be able to follow with perfect facility; and that in the mutation of language, the service-books should from time to time be corrected, but only when the amount of discrepancy between the archaic and ordinary tongues has become so great, that an intelligent rational worship is rendered difficult or impossible." Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, p. 436.

Article XXV.

1563.

De Sacramentis.

Sacramenta à Christo instituta, non tantum sunt notæ professionis Christianorum, sed certa quædam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiæ atque bonæ in nos uoluntatis Dei, per quæ inuisibiliter ipse in nobis operatur, nostrámque fidem in se, non solum excitat, uerumetiam confirmat.

Duo à Christo Domino nostro in Euangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta, scilicet Baptismus et Cœna Domini.

Quinque illa uulgo nominata Sacramenta, scilicet, Confirmatio, Pœnitentia, Ordo, Matrimonium, et Extrema unctio, pro sacramentis euangelicis habenda non sunt, ut quæ partim à praua Apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim uitæ status sunt in scripturis quidem probati, sed sacramentorum eandem cùm baptismo et cœna Domini rationem non habentes: quomodo nec Pœnitentia, ut quæ signum aliquod uisibile seu cæremoniam a Deo institutam non habeat.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt à Christo, ut spectarentur, aut circumferrentur, sed ut ritè illis uteremur: et in hijs duntaxat qui dignè percipiunt, salutarem habent effectum: qui uerò indigne percipiunt, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

1571.

Of the Sacramentes.

Sacramentes ordayned of Christe, be not onely badges or tokens of Christian mens profession: but rather they be certaine sure witnesses and effectuall signes of grace and Gods good wyll towardes vs, by the which he doth worke inuisiblie in vs, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirme our fayth in hym.

There are two Sacramentes ordayned of Christe our Lorde in the Gospell, that is to say, Baptisme, and the Supper of the Lorde.

Those fyue, commonly called Sacramentes, that is to say, Confirmation, Penaunce, Orders, Matrimonie, and extreme Vnction, are not to be compted for Sacramentes of the gospel, being such as haue growen partly of the corrupt folowing of the Apostles, partly are states of life alowed in the scriptures: but yet haue not lyke nature of Sacramentes with Baptisme and the Lordes Supper, for that they haue not any visible signe or ceremonie ordayned of God.

The Sacramentes were not ordayned of Christ to be gased vpon, or to be caryed about: but that we should duely use them. And in such only, as worthyly receaue the same, they haue a wholesome effect or operation: But they that receaue them vnworthyly, purchase to them selues damnation, as S. Paul sayth.

i. **Connection.** From the Church, its authority, its Ministers, and the language in which its Services should be conducted, it is a natural transition to the Sacraments, and the xxvth Article forms a general introduction to a series of Articles dealing with the subject.

ii. **Source.** The Article is derived in a great measure from the Ninth of the Thirteen Articles drawn up in 1538[1], and that in its turn was largely taken from the Augsburg Confession of 1530[2].

iii. **Object.** The Title of the Article has remained uniform since 1553, and its object may be described as a threefold one :—

(α) To protest against those, who would minimize the value and efficacy of the Sacraments;

(β) To define the number of those Sacraments to which the term "Sacraments of the Gospel" may properly be applied;

(γ) To declare the necessity of right conditions on the part of the recipients.

iv. **Form and Language.** The Article in its present form differs considerably from that which it presented in 1553. Then it commenced with a clause[3], which has since been altogether withdrawn, and what formed the last clause in 1553 has taken its place. The present second and third

[1] See above, p. 12. This Article runs thus: "Docemus quod Sacramenta, quæ per verbum Dei instituta sunt, non tantum sint *notæ professionis* inter Christianos, sed magis *certa quædam testimonia* et *efficacia signa gratiæ*, et *bonæ voluntatis Dei* erga nos, per quæ Deus *invisibiliter operatur in nobis*, et suam gratiam inuisibiliter diffundit, siquidem ea rite susceperimus; quodque per ea *excitatur et confirmatur fides* in his qui eis utuntur." *De Sacramentorum Usu.*

[2] See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* pp. 63, 270. Ed. 1890.

[3] "Oure LORDE Jesus Christ hathe knitte toguether a companie of newe people with Sacramentes, moste fewe in numbre, moste easie to bee kepte, moste excellent in significatione, as is Baptisme, and the Lordes Supper." See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 306. Ed. 1859.

clauses were introduced for the first time in 1563, while the fourth is a modification of what formed the second clause of the draft of 1553[1].

v. **The Word Sacrament,** from the Latin Sacramentum, has passed through three stages of meaning, according to its (1) Classical, (2) Ecclesiastical, and (3) Later usage:—

(α) *Its Classical Usage:*—

In Early Latin the word meant

(1) An oath as calling down divine anger, if the swearer perjured himself[2];

(2) The sum of money deposited with a judge[3] as a pledge that parties in a suit would go on with it[4];

(3) The oath of the newly-enlisted soldier that he would be loyal to his commander[5].

(β) *Its Ecclesiastical Use:*—

(1) The earliest application of the word to anything Christian occurs in the celebrated letter of the younger Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, where he says of the Christians that they were wont

[1] In this clause we further note the important omission, after the statement that Sacraments "in suche only, as worthelie receiue the same, haue an wholesome effecte, and operacione," of the words, "and yet not that of the woorke wrought, as some men speake, whiche worde, as it is straunge and vnknowen to holie Scripture: So it engendereth no Godlie, but a verie supersticious sense."

[2] Comp. Hor. *Od.* ii. 17, 10, "Non ego perfidum dixi *sacramentum:* Ibimus, Ibimus."

[3] "Ea pecunia, quæ in judicium venit in litibus, *sacramentum* a sacro." Varro, *L. L.* v. 36.

[4] It was called Sacramentum either because (1) the money was deposited in a sacred place, Cic *in Verrem*, II. i. 9, 26; or (ii) because the loser of the suit forfeited his pledge to sacred temple uses; comp. Varro, *L. L.* v. 36, "qui judicio vicerat, suum *sacramentum* e sacro auferebat, victi ad ærarium redibat."

[5] Comp. Livy, vii. 11, "Dictator... omnes juniores, nullo detrectante militiam, *sacramento* adegit"; Cæsar, *Bell. Civ.* i. 23, "Milites Domitianos *sacramentum* apud se dicere jubet." Comp. also Tac. *Hist.* i. 76. This oath was taken upon the "signa militaria" or consecrated "signs," which surmounted each regimental banner.

to meet on a certain fixed day before sunrise, to sing hymns to Christ, and to bind themselves by a *Sacrament* not to commit any sort of wickedness[1].

(2) In the earlier Latin versions of the New Testament it was used as a translation of the Greek word Μυστήριον or Mystery. Thus in 1 Cor. ii. 7, for *we speak God's wisdom in a mystery*, the Old Latin Version had "dicimus Dei sapientiam in *sacramento*"; and in 1 Cor. xiii. 2, where the Apostle says *though I know all mysteries*, it had "si scio omnia *sacramenta*[2]."

(γ) *Later Usage:*

Hence the word came to be applied in a wide and general sense to anything whatsoever that could be called a mystery, or sacred symbol. Thus "revealed truths" are spoken of as Sacraments, and we find such expressions as "the Sacrament of the Trinity[3]," "the Sacrament of the Incarnation[4]," "the Sacrament of the Passion and Resurrection[5]." Thus, again, the touching the catechumen with spittle[6], the salt given to catechumens[7], the Creed taught to catechumens[8], the honey and milk given after

[1] "Seque *sacramento* non in scelus aliquod obstringere, sed ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent." Plin. *Epist.* x. 97. Tertullian, again, speaking of the Christian's Baptismal vow, says that "he is called to the warfare of the living God, and makes answer to the words of the Sacrament." Tertull. *ad Martyres*, cap. iii.

[2] Again in Rom. xvi. 25 we have for κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου, "in revelatione *sacramenti*"; and in Eph. i. 9, for τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, we have "*sacramentum* voluntatis suæ."

[3] Isid. Hisp. *de Scrip. Eccl.* 27, i. 4, 6.

[4] Leo M., *Serm.* xxiv. 4.

[5] Leo, *Serm.* liii. 4; lxi. 1.

[6] Rabanus Maurus, *de Instit. Cleri*, i. 27.

[7] The Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, ordered that at Eastertide no "Sacrament" should be ministered to catechumens "nisi solitum sal." Can. 5. Tertullian also uses the word "Sacramentum" to denote religion in general, *Adv. Marc.* v. 18.

[8] Rabanus Maurus, *de Instit. Cleri*, ii. 56.

Baptism[1] to catechumens, all these, as well as Baptism[2] and the Holy Eucharist[3] itself, were spoken of as Sacraments. Hence, owing to the almost universal application of the term, we have the simple definition of a Sacrament as given by S. Augustine, "a Sacrament is a sign of a holy thing[4]," or, as the Homily[5] expresses it, "anything whereby a holy thing is signified."

vi. **Sacraments as defined in the Article.** This examination of the word "Sacrament" itself prepares us for what is said of Sacraments in the Article. It treats of them (i) *negatively* and (ii) *positively*, and lays down (i) what they are *not*, and (ii) what they *are*:

(α) *Negatively*:—

"Sacraments," it says, "be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession." This was the teaching of men, who like the followers of the Zwinglian school[6] and the Anabaptists[7], minimized their efficacy and regarded them as mere empty rites, neither spiritual in themselves, nor working

[1] John the Deacon says, "baptizatis ...hoc genus sacramenti offertur."

[2] "Sacramentum aquæ," Tertull. *de Bapt.* i. 12; Ambrose, *Expos. Ev. Luc.* x. 48. "Sacramentum lavacri," Tertull. *de Virg. Veland.* ii. Confirmation was termed "Sacramentum olei," S. Aug. *Serm.* 227, or "unctionis," S. Aug. *in Ep. S. Joann.* c. 2.

[3] "Sacramentum Altaris," S. Aug. *Serm.* lix. 6; "Sacramentum Mensæ Dominicæ," *Serm.* 127. Cyprian applies the word Sacrament to the Trinity, and calls the Lord's Prayer a Sacrament. See Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, i. p. 298, *E. T.*

[4] "Sacramenta, id est, sacra signa." *Contra Advers. Legis et Proph.*, Lib. ii. 33, or, as he defines it elsewhere, "Signum rei sacræ."

[5] *Homily of Common Prayer and Sacraments*, pp. 353, 354. Cambridge Ed. 1850. The Catechism of the Council of Trent defines a Sacrament as "invisibilis gratiæ visibile signum ad nostram justificationem institutum."

[6] "Credo, immo scio, omnia sacramenta tam abesse ut gratiam conferant, ut ne adferant quidem, aut dispensent." Zwinglius, *Fid. Ratio ad Car. Rom. Imp.* no. vii.

[7] "Eodem modo sacramenta fidelibus supervacanea judicabant, aut saltem non necessaria esse, et exiguam utilitatem habere." Bullinger, *Adv. Anabapt.*; "Nihil omnino tribuunt Baptismo nisi quod sit Christianorum nota, qua discernuntur ab gentibus, more civili." Rogers *on the Articles*, p. 246, *n.*

anything spiritual in us. They professed to look upon them as external acts, which simply betokened a profession of the Christian faith, whereby the Christian man rather does something himself, than receives aught from these sacred signs.

(β) *Positively*:—

In opposition to this teaching the Article lays it down that Sacraments are:

(i) "Certain sure[1] witnesses, and

(ii) "Effectual signs[2] of grace, and God's good will towards us,

(iii) "By the which He

(*a*) "Doth work invisibly in us, and

(*b*) "Doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Him."

Herein the language of the Article closely approximates to that of the Church Catechism, where a Sacrament is defined to be "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof[3]".

[1] They are described not merely as "quædam testimonia," but "certa quædam testimonia." Certus = (1) *determined, established, settled;* (2) *sure, unerring, indubitable;* comp. "*Certam* hastam," Virg. *Æn.* xi. 767; "*certa* sagitta," Hor. *Od.* i. 12, 23; "*certa* fides segetis," Hor. *Od.* iii. 16, 30.

[2] "Efficacia signa," not merely "signa." "A Sacrament thus not only typifies, it conveys. It is not a bare sign, but an *effectual* sign, a sign that carries its effect along with it. It is the means whereby we receive the same grace, of which it is the outward visible sign." See Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, p. 441.

[3] "Signum externum et visibile gratiæ internæ et spiritualis nobis collatæ, a Christo Ipso institutum, tanquam instrumentum per quod eam recipimus, et pignus quod eam nobis confirmet." The language alike of the Catechism and the Article expresses in the plainest manner the *objective* view of the Sacraments. They regard them as Divine Gifts which, external to the *subjective* attitude of the recipient, are what they are whether or not they are believed to be such. "Since the glorification of Christ, and the outpouring of His Spirit, we are presented with signs,

vii. **Material things** have in all ages been used by God as *signs* and *pledges*. Thus

(i) *The Rainbow* was a sign to Noah that the world would no more be destroyed by a flood (Gen. ix. 12—17);

(ii) *Circumcision* was a sign and pledge to Abraham of the Covenant between God and himself (Gen. xvii. 9—14);

(iii) *The Miracles* Moses was bidden to perform before Pharaoh were signs and pledges of his Divine Mission (Ex. iv. 1—9);

(iv) *The Fleece*, wet while the ground around was dry, and dry while the ground around was wet, was a sign and pledge to Gideon that the Lord would give him victory in the battle against the Midianites (Judg. vi. 36—40).

viii. **Material things,** again, have been used by God as *supernatural means* of Grace. Thus

(i) When the Israelites were dying in the desert from the bites of the fiery serpents, God bade Moses set up a brazen serpent on a pole, *and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he looked unto the serpent of brass, he lived* (Num. xxi. 6—9);

(ii) When Naaman, afflicted with leprosy, came to Elisha, he was bidden to go and dip himself seven times in the Jordan, and he went, *and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean* (2 Kings v. 10—14);

which not only speak of spiritual mysteries, but convey the things which they speak of.... If the Sacraments were what Zwingli made them, they would not be Christian. Christ could not have devised what the Article calls 'only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession.'" Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 259 sqq. Ed. 1888.

(iii) When our Lord saw a man blind from his birth, and would heal him, *He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay*[1], *and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam. He went away therefore, and washed, and came seeing* (John ix. 6, 7);

(iv) Again, when one that was deaf and had an impediment in his speech was brought unto Him, *He took him aside from the multitude privately, and put His fingers into his ears, and He spat, and touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, He sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened. And his ears were opened, and the bond of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain* (Mark vii. 31—35)[2].

Now in Sacraments ordained by Christ all these methods of using material things are combined. For

(1) They are "sure witnesses[3]" (*testimonia*)
(2) They are "effectual[4] signs" (*signa*)

} of Grace, and God's good will towards us,

[1] Ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς = *He spread the clay thereof upon his eyes.* Physicians had applied *saliva jejuna* as a remedy for post-natal blindness, but congenital blindness had always been regarded as incurable, and no instance to the contrary had ever been heard of. The Great Physician, however, teaches us that ordinary means can accomplish extraordinary results at His will. Comp. Vespasian's reputed miracle, Tac. *Hist.* iv. 81; Sueton. *Vesp.* 5.

[2] In this miracle the use of outward signs is most diversified. Our Lord (1) takes the man aside; (2) He puts His fingers into his ears; (3) He touches his tongue with the moisture of His mouth; (4) He looks up to heaven; (5) He sighs; (6) He speaks the potent word *Ephphatha.*

[3] "They are witnesses of Grace, or, in stricter theological language, they signify Grace. They are types of that holiness and righteousness which they convey." Bp Forbes, p. 440.

[4] "It was the glory of the Christian as compared with the Jewish Church, that in her fold shadows were transmuted to substance, symbols to means of grace, types to instruments of salvation, rituals to channels of higher powers. What was before a pious usage—an intimation, a memento, a suggestion only—was now become the medium of Divine power, and an in-

(3) They are "pledges (*pignora*) of His love[1]";

(4) They are appointed means (*media*), "by the which He doth work invisibly in us[2]."

ix. **The number of the Sacraments of the Gospel.** Having dealt with the nature of the Sacraments, the Article proceeds to deal with the number of such as can properly be called "Sacraments of the Gospel." The word Sacrament, as we have seen, is capable of a very wide application to any visible sign that sets out to the eyes and other outward senses the inward working of the Grace of God. But in the present Article the word is not taken in this wide sense. It is restricted here, as in the Church Catechism, to such Sacraments as were ordained by Christ our Lord[3]. In the Gospels we find no other Sacraments expressly ordained by Christ Himself, save Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. These are the chief, the principal, the special Sacraments of our salvation[4].

x. **The Five so-called Sacraments.** As regards the other five commonly called Sacraments, the Article now

strument of sanctification." Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. p. 36. Ed. 1877.

[1] Compare the language of the Exhortation in the Communion Service, "He hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as *pledges* of His love." "A pledge to assure us of the inward and spiritual grace given to us, is a necessary part of the definition of a Sacrament." Bp Forbes, p. 441.

[2] "All grace flows from the humanity of Christ, and the Sacraments are main channels, whereby that grace flows into the soul. Christ is the chief and principal worker in all Sacraments, as a function of His everlasting Priesthood. They work in us by means of the institution of Christ." Ibid, p. 442. "It pleases Christ, not merely to give covenanted graces along with the faithful performance of prescribed ceremonies, but to make the ceremonies quite literally the means of grace, and to charge with His own fulness the thing which His Church uses or does." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 262, Ed. 1888.

[3] Twice the limiting words are introduced, "Sacramenta à Christo instituta"; "Duo à Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta."

[4] "Principalia, præcipua, eximia salutis nostræ sacramenta," Bellarmine, *de Missa*. "The two Sacraments of the Gospel, as they may be emphatically termed, are the instruments of the inward life, according to our Lord's declaration that Baptism is a new birth, and that in the Eucharist we have the living Bread." Newman, *On Justification*, Lect. vi.

proceeds to speak of them with decision. The number of the Sacraments was first fixed at seven in the twelfth century[1], and then it was received into the general teaching of the Church, not as a tradition coming down from the Apostles and the earliest times, but as the result of theological speculation. The Article does not deny that these other five, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are holy ordinances, which, in the wider sense of the word, may be called "Sacraments" or "Mysteries[2]." What it does deny is that they are to be counted for "Sacraments of the Gospel[3]" of like nature with Baptism and the Holy Eucharist. This it does on the ground that "they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God[4]." Thus

(i) *Confirmation* possesses an outward and visible sign, the laying on of hands, but there is no record of its actual institution by Christ Himself;

(ii) *Penance*, again, including Confession and Absolution, has annexed to it the inward Grace of the Forgiveness of Sins, but it lacks any outward sign instituted[5] and attached to it by Divine authority;

[1] The number was specially determined through the influence of Peter Lombard, but nothing was absolutely decided till the time of Bonaventura and S. Thomas Aquinas. See Hagenbach, *Hist. Doct.* ii. pp. 320, 321.

[2] See the Eighth Article of the Second Bonn Conference, p. 20, and the observations upon it of the late Bishop of Winchester, p. 21.

[3] Even Alexander of Hales, though he adopted the number Seven, admitted that Baptism and the Holy Eucharist alone were instituted by our Lord Himself, and S. Thomas Aquinas agrees with other theologians in regarding these two Sacraments as "potissima Sacramenta." See *Summa*, pt. iii. qu. 62.

[4] "If a Sacrament must be defined to be 'an outward sign' ordained by God or Christ, then only Baptism and the Lord's Supper are in this sense 'Sacraments'." Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, pp. 449, 450.

[5] The Homily on *Common Prayer and Sacraments* expressly says that Absolution has the inward grace of "the forgiveness of sins," only not by express words of the New Testament annexed and tied to the visible sign. We have traces of Penance in the Sub-Apostolic Age in the Didaché, iv. 14, Ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξομολογήσῃ τὰ παραπτώματά σου, and xiv. 1, εὐχαριστήσατε προεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

(iii) *Orders* is the name given to the rite whereby men are raised to the Clerical State. Both the outward sign and the inward gift are named by S. Paul, when he bids Timothy *stir up the gift of God, which is in him through the laying on of* the Apostle's *hands* (2 Tim. i. 6)[1]. But though it is a "state of life allowed in the Scriptures," we have no account of any express institution by Christ Himself of imposition of hands as its outward sign;

(iv) *Marriage* is a "state of life allowed in the Scriptures[2]," but it is not of universal obligation, and, though it is a "mystery," it possesses no outward sign expressly ordained by God or Christ[3];

(v) *Extreme Unction* of the sick, when all hope of recovery is gone, and death is imminent, grew up out of "the corrupt following" or imitation of the Apostles, who anointed the sick with oil[4], with a view to their recovery as well

[1] Ἀναμιμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου. Note the expressive word, here only used, ἀναζωπυρεῖν=*to stir* or *fan into a flame.*

[2] The words "quae partim...in scripturis quidem probati" are not intended to divide exactly the five Sacraments in question, but simply to suggest in general terms how they came to be what *in actual use* they were when the Article was written.

[3] S. Paul says of marriage τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν, Eph. v. 32. The Apostle, however, is *directly* applying the term μυστήριον not to marriage, but rather to the mystical union betwixt Christ and His Church, of which the holy estate of Matrimony is a figure.

[4] Anointing with oil for *medicinal* purposes played an important part in early times, especially in the East. The prophet Isaiah alludes to its use as an ointment for mollifying wounds (Isai. i. 6); the good Samaritan is described as pouring *oil and wine* on the wounds of the man who fell among thieves (Luke x. 34); the Apostles are expressly recorded to have employed it for the purpose of healing (Mark vi. 13); and we find its *Sacramental* use in S. James v. 14 where we read, *Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the Church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord will raise him up, and if he have committed any sins, it shall be*

physical as spiritual, but they are nowhere recorded to have resorted to this Unction only when the sick lay *in extremis*[1].

Thus it is clear that however properly these five Rites may be regarded as "Sacramental," they cannot by any possibility be placed on the same footing with the two "Sacraments of the Gospel," or regarded as of a nature identical with theirs[2].

xi. **The Right Use of the Sacraments.** The last paragraph of the Article lays it down that the purpose of Christ in ordaining the Sacraments was not that they should be "gazed upon" or "carried about." The words have reference to the procession of the Host and attendant ceremonies in the Latin Church, especially on Corpus Christi Day[3]. For the importance attached by the popular estimate of the time to such usages, whatever may be their ecclesiastical authority, there is no warrant in Scripture, or in the custom of the Primitive Church. The Article states that on the contrary Sacraments were ordained that "we should duly use them," and that in

forgiven him. Here the sick man is evidently contemplated as likely to recover, and prayer and Unction are to be used as a means towards that recovery, as well as towards his spiritual aid. Hence in the Greek Church Unction is so used now, and in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. it was allowed if the sick man should desire it.

[1] The Article does not intend to depreciate Holy Unction of the Sick, but, first, to assign to it its proper position as compared with the "potissima sacramenta," and, next, to indicate that its contemporary use was not in strict accordance with its original institution. With regard to such Unction it may be observed: (i) that, although suggested by common Eastern usage, it was actually distinct from the gift of healing, which was not confined to the Elders, and had its own special accompanying sign, the laying on of hands (Mark xvi. 18); (ii) that its special accompaniment was prayer, and its result (provided there were faith and repentance) consolation and forgiveness, *sometimes* physical recovery or relief. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. 42, sqq. E. T. Ed. 1877.

[2] Comp. Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. Can. 3. "Si quis dixerit, hæc septem sacramenta ita esse inter se paria, ut nulla ratione aliud sit alio dignius: anathema sit."

[3] Instituted by Pope Urban IV., A.D. 1264, and Pope Clement V., A.D. 1311.

such only as "worthily receive them have they a wholesome effect or operation." This is intended as a caution against the doctrine that Sacraments *justify* mechanically, so to speak, through the mere performance of them, irrespective of the faith of the recipient[1]. This the Article repudiates, and quotes in corroboration the stern words of S. Paul concerning profane recipients of the Holy Eucharist in the Church of Corinth. The Apostle writes respecting the disorderly mode of reception to which they were addicted: *he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgement*[2] *unto himself, if he discern not the Body* (1 Cor. xi. 29), and he goes on to say that this was proved by the fact that many of the members of the Church were weak and sickly, and not a few had slept the sleep of death. S. Paul thus clearly contemplates a proper and improper mode of approaching the Holy Sacrament, and the legitimate induction from his words supports the statement of the Article as to the necessity of a worthy reception of all holy mysteries, if they are to exercise "a wholesome effect or operation."

[1] S. Augustine, balancing with sound judgment the *objective* and the *subjective*, distinguishes in a Sacrament (i) *The Sacramentum* or Material Sign; (ii) *The Res Sacramenti*, or Spiritual Grace; (iii) *The Virtus Sacramenti*, or "wholesome effect or operation." The two former have their objective reality quite independently of the recipient. But the *Virtus Sacramenti*, or "salutary effect," is wrought out only in such as worthily receive this holy mystery. In other words while a Sacrament confers Grace *ex opere operato*, i.e. by virtue of the Gift of God, who originates it, it has not its salutary effect *ex opere operato*, for that effect depends (in part), not upon mere mechanical reception, but upon human moral correspondence. Hence S. Paul exhorts the Corinthians that they *receive not the grace of God in vain* (2 Cor. vi. 1), and in another place testifies that *God's grace which was bestowed upon him was not found in vain* (1 Cor. xv. 10).

[2] Μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα (1 Cor. xi. 29) = *if he discern not*, or *discriminate not, the Body*, see R.V. *in loc.* and margin.

ARTICLE XXVI.

1563.

Ministrorum malitia non tollit efficaciam institutionum diuinarum.

Qvamuis in Ecclesia uisibili bonis mali semper sint admixti, atque interdum ministerio uerbi et sacramentorum administrationi præsint, tamen cùm non suo sed Christi nomine agant, eiúsque mandato et autoritate ministrent, illorum ministerio uti licet, cum in verbo Dei audiendo, tum in sacramentis percipiendis. Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratia donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et ritè sibi oblata percipiunt, quæ propter institutionem CHRISTI et promissionem efficacia sunt, licet per malos administrentur.

Ad Ecclesiæ tamen disciplinam pertinet, ut in malos ministros inquiratur, accusentúrque ab hijs, qui eorum flagitia nouerint, atque tandem iusto conuicti judicio, deponantur.

1571.

Of the vnworthynesse of the ministers, which hinder not the effect of the Sacramentes.

Although in the visible Churche the euyl be euer myngled with the good, and sometime the euyll haue cheefe aucthoritie in the ministration of the worde and Sacramentes: yet forasmuch as they do not the same in their owne name but in Christes, and do minister by his commission and aucthoritie, we may vse their ministrie, both in hearing the word of God, and in the receauing of the Sacramentes. Neither is y^e^ effecte of Christes ordinaunce taken away by their wickednesse, nor the grace of Gods gyftes diminished from such as by fayth and ryghtly do receaue the Sacramentes ministered vnto them, which be effectuall, because of Christes institution and promise, although they be ministred by euyll men.

Neuertheless, it apparteyneth to the discipline of the Churche, that enquirie be made of euyl ministres, and that they be accused by those that haue knowledge of their offences: and finally, beyng founde gyltie by iust iudgement, be deposed.

1. **Connection.** If the Sacraments are "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession," but "sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace," the important question arises, "Does their efficacy depend on the worthiness of him who ministers them"? It is to this question

that the Article, which we have now to consider, contains an answer.

ii. **Object.** It was necessary to give an answer to it, for not a few in the sixteenth century[1] made the validity of the Sacraments depend on the worthiness of those who ministered them, and some Anabaptists declined to come to the celebration of the Holy Eucharist on the ground of the questionable lives of those who celebrated at the altar[2]. This, however, was only a revival of early errors, for the Novatians ascribed the efficacy of the Sacraments to the character of the Minister, and the Donatists[3] refused to recognise the Ordination of Cæcilian by Felix of Apthonga on the ground that he had during persecution delivered up the sacred books and vessels. These ideas were revived again and again during the Middle Ages in consequence of the corrupt lives of many ecclesiastics, and were held by the adherents of Arnold of Brescia, the Vaudois[4] and the less informed followers of Wiclif and Huss[5].

iii. **Origin.** In its original shape the present Article formed the conclusion of the Fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538, and is expressed almost in the selfsame words. The Fifth of these Thirteen Articles in its turn derived[6] at

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 103, *n.* 2.

[2] The *Reformatio Legum* speaks of Anabaptists, who separated from the Lord's Table on the plea that they were deterred "vel *ministrorum improbitate* vel aliorum fratrum." Cf. Alley, *Poore Man's Librarie*, i. 242 *b.*

[3] The Confession of Augsburg specially mentions the Donatists and others like them, "qui negabant licere populo uti ministerio malorum in Ecclesia, et sentiebant ministerium malorum inutile et inefficax esse." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 171.

[4] "The Vaudois maintained that priests in mortal sin could not consecrate the Eucharist, and that the transubstantiation took place not in the hand of the unworthy celebrator, but in the mouth of the worthy communicant; that a bad priest could not absolve; that it was better to confess to a pious laic than to a wicked clergyman." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 480.

[5] Their views led at the time of the Reformation to the idea not that the beneficial effect only, but the reality also of the Sacrament depended on the interior disposition, and the faith of him to whom the Sacrament was administered.

[6] The Fifth of the Thirteen Articles

least some expressions from the Sixth and Seventh of the Augsburg series, though in other respects it departed considerably from that confession[1].

iv. **Analysis.** The Article lays down the following propositions:—That

(α) The Sacraments have an objective value in virtue of their institution by Christ and the promise He has annexed to them, and therefore they do not depend for their efficacy on the character of the Minister;

(β) The Clergy, who minister them, do so, not in their own name, but in the name of Christ;

(γ) The Grace of God's gifts is not "diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men[2]";

(δ) Nevertheless the exercise of godly discipline as regards evil ministers is an absolute duty on the part of the Church, which she cannot put aside.

v. **The Teaching of Holy Scripture** in reference to the above points is quite clear. Our Lord Himself, the great *Shepherd and Bishop of souls* (1 Pet. ii. 25), laid it

of 1538 runs, "Et *quamvis in Ecclesia ...mali sint bonis admixti, atque* etiam *ministeriis verbi et sacramentorum* nonnunquam *præsint; tamen cum ministrent non suo sed Christi nomine, mandato, et auctoritate, licet eorum ministerio uti,* tam *in verbo audiendo quam in recipiendis sacramentis,* juxta illud: 'Qui vos audit, me audit.' Nec *per eorum malitiam minuitur effectus, aut gratia donorum* Christi *rite* accipientibus; sunt enim *efficacia propter promissionem* et ordinationem Christi, etiamsi *per malos* exhibeantur." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.* p. 264. Ed. 1859.

[1] *Sylloge Confessionum,* pp. 152, 153.

[2] Comp. Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. Can. 7. "Si quis dixerit, non dari gratiam per hujusmodi sacramenta semper et omnibus, quantum est ex parte Dei, etiam si rite ea suscipiant, sed aliquando et aliquibus: anathema sit."

down again and again that in the visible Church the evil would ever be mingled with the good. He warned His Apostles that the tares would be mixed with the wheat (Matt. xiii. 30), the sheep with the goats (Matt. xxv. 32), the good fish with the bad (Matt. xiii. 47, 48), the good grain with the chaff (Matt. iii. 12), the fruitful with the unfruitful branches of the vine[1] (John xv. 1 sqq.). To expect therefore perfection of the Ministers of Christ's Sacraments is to expect what cannot be realized in this mortal life[2], and no care and pains will infallibly prevent evil and depraved men from joining the most holy societies. Moreover our Lord Himself bade His disciples do whatever the Scribes and Pharisees bade them, not because they were themselves good men, but because *they sat in Moses's seat* (Matt. xxiii. 2, 3), and thus held an acknowledged official position, and He Himself had to bear with a Judas amongst His own Apostles. But as no one would be justified in refusing to accept Apostolic doctrine because one traitor was found in the original Apostolic College, so to reject the Sacraments because of the personal shortcoming of the Minister thereof, would be to acknowledge that they *did* minister in their own name, and not by Christ's institution, commission, and authority, and to introduce disastrous confusion. In direct opposition to this the Apostles teach not that holiness in the Minister, but that God's blessing on his Ministry, is the cause of blessing to the Church and to human souls. They remind their

[1] S. Paul also compares the Church to *a great house*, in which *are not only vessels of gold and of silver, but also of wood and of earth, and some unto honour, and some unto dishonour* (2 Tim. ii. 20).

[2] "God sometimes works," writes S. Chrysostom, "even by those who are unworthy; nor is the Grace of Baptism at all impaired by the life of the priest." *Hom.* viii. in 1 Cor. Gregory of Nazianzum maintains that "the Baptism of Peter is no better than that of Judas, and he illustrates his assertion by the fact that a seal of iron gives as perfect an impression as a seal of gold." *Orat. de Bapt.*

converts that *Paul may plant and Apollos water*[1], *but it is God that giveth the increase* (1 Cor. iii. 6, 7), and that, great and glorious as is the Christian Ministry, yet *the treasure is in earthen vessels, to the intent that the greatness of the power may be of God and not of men*[2] (2 Cor. iv. 7).

vi. **Ecclesiastical Discipline.** Still, while the Article has a side of *comfort*[3], for it would indeed be overwhelming if the validity of the Sacraments were to depend upon the personal character of the Minister, yet it has also a side of *warning* as to the necessity of seeing that those, who minister in holy things, be themselves men of holiness, and as to the need of godly discipline to secure this end. The Scripture testimony on this point is unmistakeable. (*α*) *The Old Testament* teaches us that even under a typical Dispensation *the Lord would be sanctified in them that come nigh Him* (Lev. x. 3), and would have *His priests clothed with righteousness* (Ps. cxxxii. 9), and the judgments which fell upon two of the sons of Aaron (Lev. x. 1, 2) for *offering strange fire before the Lord*, and on the sons of Eli for their immoral living (1 Sam. iv. 10, 11), attest the purity of life required of those who ministered to the Lord in holy things even under the Old Covenant. (*β*) Similarly the New Testament gives special instructions as regards the discipline of the Clergy, and S. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles enforces stringent rules as to *laying hands hastily on no*

[1] Ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα, Ἀπολλὼς ἐπότισεν, ἀλλ' ὁ θεὸς ηὔξανεν = (*God was giving the increase*). "Observe the force of the *imperfect*, implying a continual bestowing of divine grace, as distinguished from the transitory *acts* of His Ministers, Paul and Apollos, whose operations are described by the aorists, *ἐφύτευσα, ἐπότισεν*." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.*

[2] "We," says the Apostle, "carry the treasure of Christ; we bear it through the world in its triumphal progress; we dispense it to the people; but we bear it, not in vessels of gold and silver—like those in which the treasures of earthly conquerors is borne—but in vessels of clay; in order that the excellency of the power of what we dispense in the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments may be, and be seen to be, of God, and not of men." Bp C. Wordsworth on 2 Cor. iv. 7.

[3] F. D. Maurice, *Sermon on the xxxix. Articles.*

man[1] (1 Tim. v. 22). He also directs that, while Timothy must not rashly *receive an accusation against an elder*, yet *he must reprove in the sight of all, them that sin*[2], *that the rest also may be in fear* (1 Tim. v. 19, 20), and thus exercise that ecclesiastical discipline, which all ages of the Church have acknowledged to be part of her duty.

vii. **The Doctrine of Intention.** As regards the doctrine laid down by the Council of Trent that on the part of the Minister of any Sacrament "there is required the intention at least of doing what the Church does[3]," it will be sufficient to quote the words of Hooker. "What a man's private mind is," he writes, "as we cannot know, so neither are we bound to examine; therefore always in these cases the known intent of the Church generally doth suffice, and where the contrary is not manifest, we may presume that he which outwardly doth the work, hath inwardly the purpose of the Church of God[4]." The "known intent" of the English Church to do what the Church does is plain from the words of the preface to our services of Ordination[5]. Where we have the external conditions of validity for a Sacrament[6], a right *form* and *matter*, and

[1] Χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, 1 Tim. v. 22. *Manus cito nemini imposueris*, Vulg. "Indisputably the most ancient interpretation of these words is the imposition of hands in Ordination, περὶ χειροτονούντων, Chrys., Bp Ellicott *in loc.* So also Bp Pearson, *Minor Works*, ii. p. 385, and the first collect for the Ember Weeks, "lay hands suddenly on no man."

[2] Τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας, *persistentes in peccato*. "Those πρεσβύτεροι, who sin and continue in sin, and are known to continue in sin; rebuke them before all." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.*

[3] "Si quis dixerit, in ministris, dum sacramenta conficiunt et conferunt, non requiri intentionem saltem faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia: anathema sit." Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. Can. 11.

[4] Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 58, 3.

[5] "And therefore, to the intent that these orders (the old orders of the Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons) may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England," the English Church provided a proper Minister, and a proper rite, valid in "matter and form." See below under Article xxxvi.

[6] Canon Estcourt allows that "the intention requisite for the valid administration of a sacrament is the '*intentio generalis faciendi quod facit Ecclesia*'." *Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed*, p. 199; see also Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 156.

Minister, there "no spiritual disqualification, whether in understanding or morals, on the part of the administrator, is a bar to the validity of the rite, and this because of the great principle that the giver of the grace is not the minister, but the Holy Spirit[1]." To go beyond the known intent of the Church, and to enquire into the Minister's private mind, is, in the words of Bishop Jewel, to venture into "the very dungeon of uncertainty[2]," an uncertainty which would make all Orders and all Sacraments precarious. We may well be content with the dictum of S. Thomas Aquinas himself[3], when he says, "The Minister of a Sacrament acts as the representative (*in persona*) of the whole Church of which he is the Minister; in the words which he utters *the intention of the Church is expressed*, which suffices to the perfection of a Sacrament, *unless the contrary be expressed outwardly* on the part of the Minister, or the recipient of the Sacrament[4]."

[1] See Gore's *Rom. Cath. Claims*, pp. 147, 148.

[2] See Jewel, *Reply to Harding*, Art. 1, sect. 12. Ed. Parker Soc. "The heart of man," he adds, "is unsearchable. If we stay upon the intention of a mortal man, we may stand in doubt of our own baptism."

[3] S. Thom. Aquin. *Summa*, Pars iii., Qu. lxiv., Art. 8, ad. 2. S. Thomas prefers this view on the ground "quia character nunquam imprimitur nisi per sacramentum," meaning by "character" the "effectus qui est res et sacramentum," as distinct from the *Virtus Sacramenti*. See Denny and Lacey, *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 87, sect. 133; Denny, *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*, pp. 93—98, S.P.C.K. 1893.

[4] Bellarmine says, "It is not necessary to intend to do what the Roman Church does, but what the true Church does, whatever it may be; or what Christ instituted...He who intends to do what the Church of Geneva does intends to do what the Church Universal does...the error of the Minister as to the Church does not take away the efficacy of the Sacrament." Bellarmine, *Disputationes de Controversiis*. De Sacram. in gen. i. c. 27.

Article XXVII.

1563.

De Baptismo.

Baptismus non est tantùm professionis signum ac discriminis nota, qua Christiani à non Christianis discernantur, sed etiam est signum Regenerationis, per quod tanquam per instrumentum rectè baptismum suspitientes[1], ecclesiæ inseruntur, promissiones de Remissione peccatorum atque Adoptione nostra in filios Dei, per Spiritum sanctum uisibiliter obsignantur, fides confirmatur, et ui diuinæ inuocationis, gratia augetur.

Baptismus paruulorum omnino in ecclesia retinendus est, ut qui cum Christi institutione optimè congruat.

1571.

Of Baptisme.

Baptisme is not only a signe of profession, and marke of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened: but is also a signe of regeneration or newe byrth, whereby as by an instrument, they that receaue baptisme rightly, are grafted into the Churche: the promises of the forgeuenesse of sinne, and of our adoption to be the sonnes of God, by the holy ghost, are visibly signed and sealed: fayth is confyrmed: and grace increased by vertue of prayer vnto God. The baptisme of young children is in any wyse to be retayned in the Churche, as most agreeable with the institution of Christe.

i. **Connection.** Having spoken of the Sacraments generally the Articles proceed to treat of them particularly and separately, and first they deal with Holy Baptism.

ii. **Source.** It is difficult to find any exact model, on which the xxviith Article is framed. It bears but little resemblance to any Article in any other Confession, either English or foreign, though a few expressions may be traced to the Sixth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538.

[1] An error of the press for "suscipientes."

iii. **Object.** It is directed against two opposite classes of opinion:—

(i) That of those, who, like the Anabaptists, regarded Baptism merely as a professional badge or sign of membership in the Christian Society, and repudiated Infant Baptism altogether[1];

(ii) That of those who, like the extreme Mediæval School, unduly exalted the efficacy of the Sacrament[2].

iv. **Analysis.** The Article begins by asserting (i) What Baptism is *not*, and (ii) What it *is*:—

(1) "It is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened[3];

(2) But it is also a sign of Regeneration[4] or new Birth, whereby, as by an instrument[5],

[1] "Because they admit not original sin, they (the Anabaptists) also refuse the baptisme of chyldren, and in as muche as in them lyeth, they drawe awaye the moste parte of men from God, and eternall salvation." Hermann's *Consultation*, T. vii. Lond., 1547.

[2] Some of this school taught the doctrine of "a quasi-physical union of the Holy Spirit with the element of water." See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 105, *n.* Ed. 1859.

[3] The Latin here is "a non Christianis."

[4] In 1553 the Latin ran "signum regenerationis" as now, but the English was "a signe, and seale of our newe birth." In 1563 it was altered to "a signe of regeneration or newe byrth."

[5] *Instrumentum* in Classical Latin denotes (1) an *implement* or *tool* of any kind, comp. Cæsar, *B. G.* vi. 30; (2) the *utensils necessary for any business*, as that of the painter, the surgeon, the fowler, the huntsman. Comp. Pliny, *Epp.* iii. 19, 3. Here the figure seems to be taken from the grafting-knife of the gardener, whereby he grafts a shoot of one tree into the branch of another, and by the union produces fresh life. Comp. Bucerus in *Retract. in Matth.*, "agnoscit sacramenta recte dici *instrumenta*, organa et canales gratiæ"; Sir Thomas More, *Works*, i. 386, "God in the working of such clensing of the soule and infusion of grace, useth the sacramentes not as a *bare signe*, but as an *instrument*, with whiche and by whiche it pleaseth hym to worke them"; Ridley, *Disputation at Oxford*, "This Sacrament [the Eucharist] hath a promise of grace, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given by it, *as by an instrument*," *Works*, Ed. P. Society, p. 241; see Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 393. Ed. 1859.

(α) They that receive Baptism rightly are grafted[1] into the Church;

(β) The promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed[2],

(γ) Faith is confirmed,

(δ) And Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God[3]."

v. **Infant Baptism.** Having stated thus much concerning Baptism generally, the Article proceeds to speak of Infant Baptism. And here it differs considerably from the original draft of 1553. Then the clause ran, "The custome of the Church to christen yonge children, is to bee commended, and in any wise to be reteined in the Churche[4]." This clause is simply permissive and almost apologetic. In the Article, as altered in 1563, a different complexion was given to it. "The Baptism of young children," ran the amended clause, "is in any wise[5] to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ."

[1] "Ecclesiæ inseruntur." *Inserere* is the technical word for (1) *sowing* or *planting in a place;* (2) *grafting*. It is constructed sometimes with *in* and the accusative, as "in pyrum sylvaticam pyrum bonam inserere," Varro *R. R.*, i. 40, 5; sometimes with the ablative, "cortice virgam inserit," Ov. *Met.* xiv. 630; sometimes with the simple accusative, "inutilesque falce ramos amputans, feliciores inserit," Hor. *Epod.* ii. 13, 14.

[2] It is noticeable that in the Latin text of 1563 there is no comma after "per Spiritum sanctum." The clause runs without break "per Spiritum sanctum uisibiliter obsignantur."

[3] "Ui diuinæ inuocationis." The words seem rather to mean "by virtue of the invocation of the Divine Name," that Triune Name, which is invoked in Baptism and by our Lord's express command forms an essential part of the Baptismal Formula.

[4] "Mos Ecclesiæ baptizandi parvulos et laudandus est et omnino in Ecclesia retinendus." The *Reformatio Legum*, "de Hæresibus," c. 18, reads "crudelis illorum impietas in baptismum irruit, quem infantibus impertiri nolunt, sed omnino nulla ratione."

[5] *In any wise* corresponds to the Latin *omnino*. "Any wise" in the sixteenth century denoted "certainly," "by all means." Wise = *way* or *manner*. The Norman form was "guise" = the A. S. wise. Comp. other*wise*, like*wise*, cross*wise*.

vi. **The Use of Water** for ceremonial purification has been familiar to all nations from the earliest times. With the Egyptians[1], the Greeks, and the Romans, solemn ablutions formed a necessary preliminary to all acts of devotion, especially prayer[2] and sacrifice[3], and were essential to the removal of all ceremonial pollution, and of the guilt of homicide[4], whether intentional or accidental.

vii. **Amongst the Jews** similar lustrations were equally frequent. We find this again and again, as when Jacob was returning from Padanaram to Palestine (Gen. xxxv. 2); when the Jewish people were about to receive the Law on Mount Sinai (Exod. xix. 10); when Aaron and his sons were consecrated to their office (Exod. xxix. 4); when Joshua was about to lead the host across the Jordan (Jos. iii. 5); when Solomon dedicated the Temple (2 Chron. iv. 2—6).

viii. **The Baptism of Proselytes.** At a later period these *divers washings* (Heb. ix. 10) were considerably multiplied. They preceded all great religious observances[5]. They accompanied all meals, and many of the most ordinary avocations of daily life (Mark vii. 3, 4). Moreover by Baptism, together with Circumcision and Sacrifice, all Israelites were admitted into covenant with God, and whenever a Gentile proselyte desired to enter the common-

[1] Herodotus tells us that the Egyptian priests bathed twice in the day and twice in the night to fit them for their sacred functions. Hdt. *Hist.* ii. 37.

[2] Comp. Hom. *Od.* iv. 759—761,

Ἡ δ' ὑδρηναμένη, καθαρὰ χροΐ εἵματ' ἐλοῦσα,
εἰς ὑπερῷ' ἀνέβαινε σὺν ἀμφιπόλοισι γυναιξίν·
ἐν δ' ἔθετ' οὐλοχύτας κανέῳ, ἠρᾶτο δ' Ἀθήνῃ.

Also Ovid, *Fast.* v. 680,

"Spargit et ipse suos lauro rorante capillos:
Et peragit solita fallere voce *preces*."

[3] Comp. Plaut. *Aulular.* iii. 8, 534, "Eo *lavatum* ut sacrificem."

[4] Comp. Virg. *Æn.* ii. 718, "Me bello e tanto digressum et cæde recenti
Attrectare nefas, *donec me flumine vivo
Abluero*."

[5] Compare Mark vii. 4; John ii. 6, iii. 25, xi. 55.

wealth of Israel, and to take the yoke of the Law upon him, Baptism was one of the essential ceremonies, so that it was an accepted axiom, "No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized[1]."

ix. **The Baptism of John[2].** Hence when John the Baptist came to announce the Advent of the Messiah, and demanded that the Chosen People themselves should submit to his Baptism, if they would have a place in the Kingdom of Heaven, the Jews were not astonished at this, as though it was something unintelligible. It was a common saying with them that the sins of Israel delayed the coming of the Messiah, while their repentance would hasten it. Consequently *Jerusalem, and all Judæa, and all the region round about Jordan* (Matt. iii. 5) flocked forth to John, and *were baptized of him* after public confession of sin[3] (Mark i. 5).

x. **The Baptism of our Lord.** The Baptism of John was in the strictest sense of the word preparatory. It possessed an outward and visible sign of a life-giving change, but the inward spiritual Grace in the fullest sense of the term was reserved for Christian Baptism. For Christ too adopted the ancient custom, but He enriched it with a new significance and a still mightier efficacy. First of all He Himself submitted to the Baptismal Rite[4] in the

[1] See Schurer's *Jewish People in the time of Jesus Christ*, Div. ii. Vol. ii., p. 319; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, pp. 745, 747, Ed. 2, 1884; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. iii. 6.

[2] The Johannine Baptism was not a mere repetition of the Baptism which accompanied Circumcision or of the Baptism of Proselytes, nor was it equivalent to Christian Baptism; it was more than the one, and less than the other; it was a Symbol of Repentance, but it was not a Laver of Regeneration; and persons who had received it were baptized, if they became Christians, with the distinctively Christian Baptism. Comp. Luke iii. 3; Tit. iii. 5; Acts xix. 1—7; and see Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. pp. 182 sqq.

[3] Ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν (Mark i. 5) = *openly confessing their sins*. On Exomologesis, see the Article in Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 644, &c.

[4] As the Jewish high priest was consecrated to his office by (1) Baptism,

Jordan, and so sanctified "Water to the mystical washing away of sin[1]." Secondly, with the same element of water He baptized by the hands of His disciples. Comp. John iii. 22, 26; iv. 1, 2. Thirdly, He directed that with the same element the Apostles should also everywhere baptize, and so admit proselytes and converts from Judaism into the Covenant of Grace, just as Circumcision had admitted into the Mosaic Covenant (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20).

xi. **Apostolic Baptism.** What Christ directed and solemnly enforced just before His Ascension (Matt. xxviii. 19) the Apostles practised. Thus (1) On the day of Pentecost S. Peter admitted upwards of three thousand of his countrymen to the Sacrament of Baptism[2] (Acts ii. 38—41); (2) Philip the Deacon baptized the Samaritans (Acts viii. 13, 16), and afterwards the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 38); (3) Saul the persecutor, though miraculously converted, was baptized by Ananias (Acts ix. 18); (4) as Paul the Apostle he baptized Lydia and her household (Acts xvi. 15), the Philippian jailor and his household (Acts xvi. 33), as also several converts at Corinth (Acts xviii. 8), sometimes doing so by his own hand, sometimes by the hands of others (1 Cor. i. 14). From that day to this Holy Baptism has been universally retained in the Christian Church, and it is plain that in primitive times it was not regarded as "a mere sign or badge," but as an actual means of

(2) Unction, (3) Sacrifice (Exod. xxix. 4—37; Levit. viii. 1—36), so our Lord was solemnly consecrated as our High Priest, (i) by Baptism in the river Jordan; (ii) by the Unction of the Holy Ghost, who descended and abode upon Him (Matt. iii. 16; Acts x. 38); (iii) by the daily sacrifice of Himself in lifelong and continuous obedience to His Father's will (Heb. x. 5, 7), and by its consummation—the sacrifice of Himself on the Altar of His Cross.

[1] See the First Prayer in the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants.

[2] Originally Christian Baptism took place in the Jordan; a mere pouring or sprinkling was never thought of, Baptism being distinctly a λουτρόν or *bath*. The three thousand of Acts ii. 41 were not all necessarily baptized on the same day. Comp. Barnab. *Epist.* xi. 8; Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii., pp. 182 sqq.

Grace, a Sacrament of Initiation, without which not even the great Apostle of the Gentiles, though miraculously converted on the road to Damascus, could be admitted into the Christian Church[1] (Acts ix. 18).

xii. **The Grace of Holy Baptism.** "Every man," as we have seen above[2], "that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam*," suffers from the original "fault and corruption" of his nature. He is "very far gone from original righteousness," and being born in sin cannot in his natural condition *see the kingdom of God*[3] (John iii. 3). For entrance into this Kingdom it is necessary that he *be born again* or *anew*[4], that he *be born of water and the Spirit* (John iii. 3, 5). Of this new birth, this translation from a state of nature into a state of Grace, Baptism is the

[1] With regard to Christian Baptism in the Sub-Apostolic Age, we may notice—

(i) *Its Initiatory Function.* Μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου, *Didache* ix. 5; Εὐχαριστία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μετασχεῖν ἐξὸν ἐστιν ἢ τῷ...λουσαμένῳ. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 66.

(ii) *Its Negative and Positive Aspects.* Τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρόν. Just. Mart. *ut supr.* Καταβαίνομεν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ γέμοντες ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ ῥύπου, καὶ ἀναβαίνομεν καρποφοροῦντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, καὶ τὸν φόβον καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἔχοντες. Barn. *Epist.* xi. 11.

(iii) *Its Relation to Faith.* While faith had to be professed before Baptism, yet the faith accepted was rather a desire than a fixed consciousness, a faith which was aided and developed by the Grace of Baptism; διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ...ἡμεῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν, Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* § 14. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church, ut supr.*

[2] See Article ix., above, p. 143.

[3] Οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ. To see means *to partake of, to have part in.* Comp. ἰδεῖν θάνατον, Luke ii. 26; θεωρεῖν θάνατον, John viii. 51. Our Lord does not say, "A man *shall* not," but "he *cannot*." It is a moral impossibility for him to have a share in the new kingdom.

[4] Ἄνωθεν. This may mean either (i) *from above*, and that (*a*) *literally*, as of the Veil of the Temple rent in twain from the top, ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν ἕως κάτω (Matt. xxvii. 51, Mark xv. 38); (*b*) *figuratively*, James i. 17; iii. 15, 17; or (ii) *afresh, from the very beginning*, Luke i. 3; Acts xxvi. 5. The former rendering is generally adopted by the Greek Fathers, the latter by the Peshitto, Ethiopic, and Latin Versions. *Nisi qui renatus fuerit denuo*, Vulg. Comp. Westcott, *in loc.*

ordained instrument. As Circumcision admitted the Jew to the privileges of the Old Covenant, so Baptism admits the Christian to the privileges of the new and better Covenant, which God has ratified with the whole world in the Blood of the Mediator, Jesus Christ. They that receive Baptism rightly[1] are new born, i.e. they "are grafted into the Church," which is Christ's "mystical Body[2]," and are made "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." As members of Christ they have assured to them privileges which "by nature they cannot have." God of His bounteous mercy signs and seals to them the promise of (i) the forgiveness of their sins[3]; (ii) the assistance of the Holy Spirit[4]; and (iii) if they do not forfeit it, of eternal life[5].

[1] *Recte*, i.e. with the right *materies*, water, and the repetition of the prescribed *formula*.

[2] "Baptism is a Sacrament that God hath instituted in His Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through His most precious merit obtain as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused Divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. 60, 2. "Admission into Christ is the great gift of Baptism. All Christians are agreed that Baptism is the act by which we are visibly incorporated into the historical Church. But if the historical Church is what we have already seen it to be, in no merely figurative sense, the Body of Christ, then incorporation into it must carry the blessing of membership in Christ...To the mind of S. Paul, inspired by the Holy Ghost, union with Christ was infinitely more than a metaphor. It did not mean to him an agreement with the principles of Christ, or sympathetic intercourse with His Person. It meant, literally, a participation in His very self." Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 267, 268, Ed. 1888. Cf. Rom. vi. 3; Gal. iii. 27.

[3] Compare the words of S. Peter to the multitudes on the day of Pentecost, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the *remission of your sins*" (Acts ii. 38); as also the words of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, "Arise, and be baptized, and *wash away thy sins*" (Acts xxii. 16). The clause in the Nicene Creed, "I acknowledge one Baptism for *the remission of sins*," explicitly connects the forgiveness of sins with Baptism. The Apostles' Creed does so by implication, when it names "the forgiveness of sins" as the first consequence of membership of the Holy Catholic Church.

[4] Compare again S. Peter's words, "Repent ye, and be baptized.....*and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*" (Acts ii. 38), and see Acts xix. 1—7.

[5] "He that believeth and is baptized *shall be saved*" (Mark xvi. 16), and salvation, in its ultimate stage, implies eternal life.

xiii. **Regeneration.** The Jews, as we have seen, were wont to speak of a proselyte as "one new born," as "one born into a new world[1]." But with infinitely greater truth may the term be applied to one baptized into the Christian Church. For whereas by nature we were born in sin and made liable to all its consequences, we are by Baptism translated from our natural state into a higher state altogether. By this *laver of regeneration*[2] (Tit. iii. 5)

[1] "The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and the servant that is made free, behold, he is like a *child new-born*." "If any man become a proselyte, he is like *a child new-born*." Lightfoot *Hor. Heb.* on John iii. 3; Waterland, *Works*, iv., p. 429; Wall on *Infant Baptism*, Introd., p. 95.

[2] Regeneration, in Greek παλιγγενεσία, was a term not unknown to Classical writers—

(i) Thus

(*a*) Plutarch applies it to the transmigration of souls, to their being born again "into a new world";

(*b*) Marcus Antoninus applies it to the revival of nature in spring time from its winter sleep, τὴν περιοδικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν τῶν ὅλων, Marc. Anton. *Meditations*, xi. 1;

(*c*) Cicero in a letter to Atticus applies it to his restoration from exile to the dignities and honours of life at Rome, *Ad Att.* vi. 6, "hanc παλιγγενεσίαν nostram";

(*d*) Again, Josephus characterizes the restoration of the Jewish nation after the captivity, as τὴν ἀνάκτησιν καὶ παλιγγενεσίαν τῆς πατρίδος, *Antiq.* xi. 3, 9. Comp. also Plautus *Captivi*, iv. 2, 111, "Diiimmortales! *iterum natus* videor, si vera autumas." See Wetstein on S. Matt. xix. 28.

(ii) With this sense of renewal, revival, restoration, the word passes into the writings of the New Testament, and there it occurs twice, and twice only—

(*α*) In S. Matthew we read how, in reply to a question of S. Peter, our Lord said, *Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration* (παλιγγενεσία), *when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel* (Matt. xix. 28);

(*β*) In Titus iii. 5 S. Paul says that God *saved us through the laver of regeneration* (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας).

In the former of these passages the word denotes *the new birth of the whole creation*, the ἀποκατάστασις πάντων, the restoration of all things at the last day (comp. Acts iii. 21); in the latter it denotes in a narrower and more restricted sense *the new birth*, not of the whole creation, but *of a single soul*, "the free act of God's mercy and power, whereby He translates the sinner out of the kingdom of darkness into that of light, out of the state of nature into a state of grace." See Trench, *Synonyms*, p. 72, Ed. 1855. See also Tertullian, *De Bapt.* c. v.

we are born afresh into the Church and Family of God; and we have His gracious promises signed and sealed to us. The corruption of our mortal nature is *buried*, as it were, *with Christ through baptism into death* (Rom. vi. 4), and by virtue of His Resurrection, the first germ of Covenant Grace is given unto us "to be newly formed unto a new life, and to obey the righteousness of God." Thus the baptized, whether infant or adult, by virtue of membership with Christ is born afresh into a new relationship other than any that nature could have bestowed. He is brought into a position, wherein he not only enjoys "the everlasting benediction of God's heavenly washing," but is by adoption and Grace made partaker of Christ's Sonship, and an inheritor of eternal life.

xiv. **Infant Baptism.** The last clause of the Article is concerned with the Baptism of infants. This it affirms is "in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." It is true that those of whom we read in the New Testament as being baptized were for the most part adults, who had come to years of discretion, and therefore could not only promise repentance and faith, but also perform and keep that promise. But if "we regard Baptism as a holy cleansing, we cannot think any age superfluous for infants, considering how the human heart from the outset contains the germs of sin, however undeveloped[1]." The arguments that may be advanced in favour of Infant Baptism are many and various, but for practical purposes they may be grouped under four heads: (i) The analogy of the Jewish Covenant[2];

[1] Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 295, 2nd Edit.

[2] The analogy of Circumcision with Christian Baptism is recognised both in Scripture, Col. ii. 11, and in early Christian writers, as Justin Mart. *Dial. cum Tryph.* § 41. In S. Cyprian's time it was even doubted whether in view of "eighth day circumcision" any day earlier than the eighth was allowable for Christian Baptism. Cyprian *Epist.* lix.

(ii) The teaching of our Lord; (iii) Apostolic custom; (iv) Primitive practice.

xv. **Analogy of the Jewish Covenant.** Under the Jewish Covenant we find God distinctly commanding *every male among* the Jews to be *circumcised* (Gen. xvii. 10—14), and accordingly Jewish children were circumcised on the eighth day after birth (Levit. xii. 3). Under the same Dispensation we also find Moses engaging not only *their heads, their tribes, their elders, and their officers, even all the men of Israel*, but also *their little ones, that they shall enter into the covenant of the Lord their God* (Deut. xxix. 10—12), and enjoining that at the Feast of Tabernacles, and in the solemnity of the year of release, not only the men and women, but *the little ones* should be gathered together that they might *observe to do all the words of the law*[1] (Deut. xxxi. 12). We might naturally expect, therefore, that in Baptism, which takes the place of the Jewish rite of Circumcision (Col. ii. 11, 12), God would be willing to receive children into His new and better Covenant, unless He had expressly revealed otherwise to us[2].

xvi. **The Teaching of our Lord.** But, so far from revealing otherwise to us, His Blessed Son, who is one with Him in will and nature, when He was incarnate here on earth showed in a very special manner that children were the objects of His care and love. For on one occasion, when His disciples would have kept back certain children, who had been brought to Him by their mothers to receive His blessing[3] (Matt. xix. 13), He blamed[4] them

[1] Comp. also 2 Chron. xx. 13, and see Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxiv. 3, 4.

[2] "Sith it is certain that the grace of God is both more plentifully found and more clearly declared in the Gospel by Christ, than at that time it was in the Old Testament by Moses, it were a greater indignity if the same grace should now be thought to be either obscurer or in any part abated." Noell's *Catechism*, p. 209. Ed. Parker Society.

[3] It was customary for Jewish infants to be taken to the synagogue to be blessed by the Rabbis.

[4] Ἠγανάκτησεν (Mark x. 14) = *He*

severely for their interference; *He took the children in His arms*[1], *and blessed them, laying His hands upon them* (Mark x. 16). And if the "outward gesture and deed" of Him, whose slightest act was full of hidden meaning, be not enough, His words are decisive, for He proceeded to say, *Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven* (Matt. xix. 14).

xvii. **Apostolic Custom.** Moreover, though there is no express mention in the New Testament of the Baptism of infants as such[2], yet we find S. Peter declaring to his hearers on the day of Pentecost that the promise of the Holy Ghost was *to them...and to their children* (Acts ii. 39); we find S. Paul speaking of the children of his Corinthian converts as *holy* (1 Cor. vii. 14)[3]; we find him baptizing Lydia *and her household* at Philippi (Acts xvi. 15), the gaoler *and all his* at the same place (Acts xvi. 33), as also *the household* of Stephanas at Corinth (1 Cor. i. 16), and it is difficult to believe that these families and households included no children.

xviii. **The Practice of the Primitive Church.** Though, however, there is no express mention of Infant Baptism in the New Testament, we have every reason to

was much displeased. The word expresses extreme indignation. It occurs three times in S. Matthew, xx. 24, xxi. 15, xxvi. 8; twice in S. Mark, x. 41, xiv. 4; and once in S. Luke, xiii. 14, but is not found in S. John. "The only time this strong word is used of our Lord," Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. p. 336.

[1] Ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ (Mark x. 16), even as He Himself had been taken into the arms (εἰς τὰς ἀγκάλας) of the aged Symeon, Luke ii. 28. The verb is only used by S. Mark here and in ix. 36.

[2] "When our Lord bade His Apostles make disciples or proselytes of all nations (Matt. xxviii. 19), He was addressing persons who had been accustomed to enrol in the Jewish Church their own infants and proselytes of all ages, and who, *unless expressly forbidden*, would naturally interpret His words as implying that the practice was according to His will." Abp Whately *on the Sacraments*, p. 34.

[3] S. Paul's assumption that sanctification is conferred upon children by even one Christian parent is, though indirect, perhaps the strongest evidence to be found in the Apostolic writings of the contemporary practice of Infant Baptism. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. 185 sq.

believe that it prevailed from the most primitive times. S. Irenæus, who was born probably in the year A.D. 97, and who sat at the feet of S. Polycarp, the disciple of S. John, says that our Lord came into the world in order that "through Himself He might save all men, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elders, even all who through Him are born again unto God[1]." S. Justin Martyr, writing his First Apology, about A.D. 139, mentions persons who had been made disciples to Christ while children[2]. Tertullian, again, who was of full age before the death of Irenæus, gives absolutely conclusive proof that the Baptism of infants was a common practice of the Church in his own time[3]. Origen, who was born probably in the year A.D. 186, and was a disciple of the famous S. Clement of Alexandria[4], argues that infants must have original sin, asks why else they are baptized[5], and goes on to affirm that the Church received from the Apostles the tradition to administer Infant Baptism. S. Cyprian asserts of a Council of sixty-six Bishops, held A.D. 252, that they had decided that the Baptism of infants ought not to be delayed beyond the second or third day after birth.

[1] "Omnes enim venit per Semet-ipsum salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per Eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores." Iren. *adv. Hær.*, ii. 22, 4. Ed. Bened.

[2] Πολλοί τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἐξηκοντοῦται καὶ ἑβδομηκοντοῦται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθετεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσιν. Just. *Apol.*, i. 15.

[3] Tertullian asks, "Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?" *De Bapt.*, c. 18. "With characteristic freedom he expresses his own opinion that the practice might wisely be altered, stating reasons for his opinion (*de Bapt.*, c. 18). But he nowhere says one word to imply that the practice of his own contemporaries was an innovation upon the earlier usage of the Church." Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.*, i. p. 169.

[4] This Father in a passage bearing on Baptism speaks of children "being drawn up out of the water," τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνασπωμένων παιδίων. *Pædag.* iii. c. 11.

[5] See Origen, Hom. viii. on Leviticus, and his *Comment. in Ep. ad Rom.* v. 9, c. vi. 9, "Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis Baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi, quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent."

xix. **Conclusion.** Thus the analogy of the Jewish Covenant, our Lord's words[1], Apostolic custom, and primitive antiquity alike, tend not only to remove all doubt as to the propriety of admitting infants to Holy Baptism, but to make us earnestly believe that our Heavenly Father will "embrace them with the arms of His mercy; that He will give unto them the blessing of eternal life, and make them partakers of His everlasting Kingdom[2]."

[1] So far from infants being unfit for His Kingdom, our Lord says that grown men must become like them to be fit. He says that innocence, not intelligence, is the qualification; that there is no virtue in belief, but that the barrier is disbelief. See Hooker, *Ecc. Pol.* v. lxiv. 5.

[2] See the Office for the Public Baptism of Infants.

ARTICLE XXVIII.

1563.	1571.
De Cœna Domini.	*Of the Lordes Supper.*
Cœna Domini non est tantùm signum mutuæ beneuolentiæ Christianorum inter sese, uerum potiùs est sacramentum nostræ per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque adeo ritè, dignè et cum fide sumentibus, panis quem frangimus, est communicatio corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis, est communicatio sanguinis Christi.	The Supper of the Lord is not only a signe of the loue that Christians ought to haue among them selues one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our redemption by Christes death. Insomuch that to suche as ryghtlie, worthyly, and with fayth receaue the same the bread whiche we breake is a parttakyng of the body of Christe, and likewyse the cuppe of blessing is a parttakyng of the blood of Christe.
Panis et vini transubstantiatio in Eucharistia, ex sacris literis probari non potest, sed apertis scripturæ verbis aduersatur, sacramenti naturam euertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.	Transubstantiation (or the chaunge of the substaunce of bread and wine) in the Supper of the Lorde, can not be proued by holye writ, but is repugnaunt to the playne wordes of scripture, ouerthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath geuen occasion to many superstitions.
Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in cœna, tantùm cœlesti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem quo Corpus Christi accipitur, et manducatur in cœna, fides est.	The body of Christe is geuen, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heauenly and spirituall maner: And the meane whereby the body of Christe is receaued and eaten in the Supper, is fayth.
Sacramentum Eucharistiæ ex institutione Christi non seruabatur, circumferebatur, eleuabatur, nec adorabatur.	The Sacrament of the Lordes Supper was not by Christes ordinaunce reserued, caryed about, lyfted vp, or worshipped.

i. **Connection and Title.** From Holy Baptism we naturally pass on to the second of the two Sacraments of the Gospel, the Holy Eucharist. The title of the xxviiith

Article, which treats of this subject, has never varied since the first draft.

ii. **The Form and Language** of the Article, however, differ in several respects from the shape in which it originally appeared. As we have it now, it consists of four clauses. The first and second of these are the same as in the draft of 1553, save that the expression, "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament[1]" was then wanting[2]. The third clause was a new one composed in 1563[3], and took the place of a long paragraph[4], which was withdrawn as suggestive of interpretations favourable to the school of Zwingli, and savouring of his tenets. The fourth clause remains as originally drafted.

iii. **The Object** of the Article is twofold. It repudiates

(i) The errors of the Zwinglian School, which taught that the Eucharist was merely "a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one towards another";

(ii) The opposite dogma of physical transubstantiation of the Eucharistic Elements by consecration.

iv. **Analysis.** Like the preceding Article it begins

[1] "Sacramenti naturam euertit." The phrase, however, was not new. We find its equivalent "a natura sacramenti discrepat" in the Reform. Legum, *De Hæres.*, c. 19. Again, in the "Declaration of Christian Doctrine," drawn up in 1559, we have the same thought: "So dothe it utterly denye the nature of a sacrament."

[2] Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 130. Ed. 1859.

[3] It was added on the motion of Bishop Guest, as is proved by a letter found amongst the State Papers from Guest to Cecil, Dec. 22, 1566. See below, p. 343.

[4] The paragraph which was withdrawn ran: "Quum naturæ humanæ veritas requirat, ut unius ejusdemque hominis corpus in multis locis simul esse non posset, sed in uno aliquo et definito loco esse oporteat, idcirco Christi corpus, in multis et diversis locis, eodem tempore, præsens esse non potest. Et quoniam, ut tradunt Sacræ literæ, Christus in Cœlum fuit sublatus, et ibi usque ad finem sæculi est permansurus, non debet quisquam fidelium carnis ejus et sanguinis Realem et Corporalem (ut loquuntur) præsentiam in Eucharistia vel credere vel profiteri."

with negativing the low conceptions of the Sacrament entertained by some, and

(i) Lays down (*a*) negatively, and (*b*) positively, what is the true nature of the Holy Eucharist;

(ii) It condemns the mediæval doctrine of a physical transubstantiation of the Elements;

(iii) It sets forth the true doctrine of the Real Presence;

(iv) It affirms, in opposition to prevalent practices, the true object for which the Sacrament was ordained by Christ.

v. **The Account of the Institution** of the Holy Eucharist is itself sufficient to remove a low conception of its nature and object. It comes to us from three Evangelists[1] and from the Apostle Paul. Our earliest authority is the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who in the year A.D. 57 reminds the Church of Corinth of what he had himself told them respecting the institution of the Holy Eucharist, even as he had received it by direct revelation from Christ, his Ascended Lord[2] (1 Cor. xi. 23). Combining the narratives together we learn that

(*a*) The Holy Eucharist was instituted by our Lord on the eve of His Passion in an upper room at Jerusalem, during a Paschal Meal, for which He Himself had made special preparation, and

[1] Matt. xxvi. 26—29; Mark xiv. 22—25; Lk. xxii. 14—20.

[2] Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν. The Apostle establishes on an immoveable foundation the authority of his narrative. "It comes *from the Lord*, and without any other middle party than the Apostle himself. The ἐγώ, 'I,' is put at the head to give the readers an assurance of the truth of the narrative. This is what *I* hold, *I* from a good source, from the Lord Himself... If the account of the Institution of the Supper really came to Paul from the Lord, it could only be in the way of direct revelation." Godet on 1 Cor. xi. 23.

respecting which He had given the most minute instructions to His Apostles[1];

(β) As part of the ceremonial of the Passover, it was the custom for each household to partake of, amongst other things prescribed, some flat unleavened Passover cakes, while four cups of red wine mingled with water were handed round at different stages of the feast[2];

(γ) On this occasion our Lord on reaching the upper room took the place of Celebrant, or Proclaimer of the Feast, and as the solemn meal proceeded, while we read nothing of any Paschal lamb being eaten, He took one of the unleavened cakes, that had been placed before Him, and, after giving thanks, He brake it, and then gave it to His Apostles, saying, *Take, eat*[3], *This is My Body*[4], *Which is given for you*[5]; *Do This in remembrance of Me*[6];

[1] He reminds them of the approach of the Festival of the Passover (Matt. xxvi. 2); (ii) He sends two of the Apostles to make ready (Mk xiv. 13); (iii) He describes the guide who would direct them as ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων (Mk xiv. 13; Luke xxii. 10); (iv) He prescribes the words they were to address to the owner of the house whither he would lead them (Matt. xxvi. 18; Mk xiv. 14; Lk. xxii. 11); (v) He even particularizes the size and aspect of the room which he would show them, ἀνώγεον μέγα ἐστρωμένον (Mk xiv. 15; Lk. xxii. 12).

[2] "Omnes in cœna Paschali oportet quatuor pocula bibere." Buxtorf *de Cœna Domini*, pp. 299, 300; Lightfoot, *Hor. Heb.* on Matt. xxvi. 27; Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, ii. p. 485.

[3] Λάβετε, φάγετε, Matt. xxvi. 26. These words are peculiar to S. Matthew. See R.V.

[4] Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου (Matt., Mk, Luke, 1 Cor. xi. 24).

[5] Τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον (Luke xxii. 19); κλώμενον (1 Cor. xi. 24), but κλώμενον is omitted by L. T. Tr. WH. R.V. Διδόμενον means *which is being*, or, *is on the point of being, given for you.*

[6] Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 24. Ἀνάμνησις in Classical Greek means "a calling to mind," "an act of recollection"; but in the LXX. it has the fuller sense of a "commemoration." Thus in Levit. xxiv. 7 we read of the shewbread καὶ ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν προκείμενα τῷ κυρίῳ; again, in Num. x. 10, it is said of trumpets blown over the sacrifices, καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν ἀνάμνησις ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν. In the N. T. the word only occurs in one other place Heb. x. 3, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς (x. 1 ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις) ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. Here there is

(δ) Afterwards He took a cup of wine, probably the third cup, or "Cup of Blessing," and when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, *Drink ye all of This*[1]*; for This Cup is My Blood of the* [*New*] *Covenant*[2]*, Which is shed for many for the remission of sins*[3]*; Do This, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of Me*[4].

Thus calmly and deliberately, with His eyes fixed on His approaching death upon the Cross on the morrow, at one of the greatest historical Festivals of the Jews, our Lord instituted the Holy Sacrament of His Body and Blood. "What He was in no position to testify to the world on the following day, when the soldiers laid their rude hands upon Him, and bound Him—that His death was really an offering, a freewill surrender of Himself—that He testified now; 'What I give you to eat is My Body which is broken for you, what ye drink is My Blood which I shed for you[5].'"

a contrast between the sacrificial commemoration of sins under the Law, and the Eucharistic commemoration of the Redemption wrought out for us by our Lord. The Vulgate renders it "hoc facite in meam commemorationem," and the Rhemish Version, following it, translates, "Do this for a commemoration of Me."

[1] Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, Matt. xxvi. 27. These words again are peculiar to S. Matthew.

[2] Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου, τὸ τῆς διαθήκης (Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24 (the best MSS. omit καινῆς): ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου (Luke xxii. 20).

[3] Τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Matt. xxvi. 28. S. Luke xxii. 20 has τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον; S. Mark xiv. 24 has ὑπὲρ πολλῶν; *This is My Blood of the* [*New*] *Covenant, which is being*, or, *is on the point of being, poured out for you, for many, unto remission of sins.*

[4] Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἂν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, 1 Cor. xi. 25. This occurs only in S. Paul's narrative. Tyndale and Cranmer render the words, "This do as often as ye drink it, in *the* remembrance of Me." Thus, at this historic Festival, He enshrines in a unique and significant Rite the mysterious destruction of the temple of His Body, of which He had before darkly spoken, and not only recalls to the minds of His Apostles all that He had said respecting His Body as "true flesh," and His Blood as "true drink," but He actually supplies the mode of that mysterious eating and drinking, which He had before so marvellously demanded as essential to true life. See Maclear, *The Evidential Value of the Eucharist*, pp. 223 sq. 3rd Ed. S.P.C.K.

[5] Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 53. E. T. ed. 1866.

vi. **The Eucharist no mere Sign.** If, then, we deem the Institutor of this unique and unexampled Rite to have been all that He is declared to be in the Second Article, "the very and eternal God[1]," and as He is described in the Fifteenth Article, "the Lamb without spot, who, by sacrifice of himself once made, should take away the sins of the world[2]"; if we reflect on the solemn and unparalleled circumstances under which He ordained it, and the elaborate preparation He made for its Institution[3] as the culminating point of all previous announcements, whether figurative or specific, respecting His coming Passion, it is impossible to regard the Rite as "only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another." The solemn words and actions, which accompanied the Institution, testify of themselves to the surpassing dignity of this Holy Mystery, and to His death as the source of an inestimable benefit to all mankind.

vii. **The Eucharist a Sacrament of our Redemption.** Having declared what the Holy Eucharist is not, the Article proceeds to affirm what it is. It states that it is "a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death." The Passover, as often as it was celebrated by the Jews, recalled, as in a living drama[4], the great story of the deliverance of the nation from cruel and oppressive bondage in Egypt (Deut. xvi. 2, 3)[5]; a deliverance, which elevated them from the condition of slaves to that of a ransomed people, and gave them the hope of entrance into the Promised Land of Canaan. So the Eucharist is the continued setting forth of the death of Christ as the means of the deliverance, not of a single nation, but of the whole world from the bondage of sin and Satan. In the Feast

[1] See above, p. 48.
[2] See above, p. 193.
[3] See above, p. 332, *n.*
[4] Compare Deut. xvi. 5, 6; 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 10, 11.
[5] See Stanley, *Jewish Church*, i. p. 104. Ed. 1870.

of the Passover the first place had been occupied by the lamb. It had been selected with scrupulous care (Exod. xii. 5). It had been slain with solemn ceremony. Its blood had been sprinkled on the brazen altar in the outer court of the Temple, and on the side posts and upper part of the door, and it had then been roast with fire and eaten by the Paschal company with thankful commemoration of redemption from degrading bondage in Egypt. But now that "the very Paschal Lamb" was come[1], and was about to offer Himself on the Altar of His Cross, no word is said of the Jewish Paschal victim. The Bread and Wine, hitherto subordinate, now take the first place. The lamb had been eaten as a type of Him. He now ordains the Elements of Bread and Wine to be taken and received in remembrance of Him, who,

"Himself the Victim and Himself the Priest,"

was about to offer the one "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice...for the sins of the whole world."

viii. **The Inward Grace of the Sacrament.** So much for the outward part or sign of this "Sacrament of our Redemption." Respecting "the inward part, or thing signified[2]," the Article states that "to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith" receive the Elements ordained by Christ, "the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ." The truth of this state-

[1] As on the tenth day of Nisan the Paschal Lamb was selected to be kept till the fourteenth day, so our Lord had "taken care that His entry into Jerusalem should fall on the very day when, according to the ordinance of Moses, the Paschal Lamb was chosen." See Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 51. E. T. 1866.

[2] In the Holy Eucharist the outward part, the Sacramentum, or external "Signum," is an assured token of the presence of the inward part or "Res Significata," for it was ordained by Christ Himself as a *means* whereby we receive, and a *pledge* to assure us that we do truly receive, His Body and Blood. See the *Church Catechism*. The mysterious union of the outward and inward parts is brought about by the act of consecration.

ment is sufficiently confirmed by the words of our Lord Himself. For while, on the occasion of the first Passover of His Public Ministry, He had declared to Nicodemus that *as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up* (John ii. 14)[1], and on the occasion of another Passover He had declared to the Jews in the synagogue of Capernaum that His Flesh was *true meat*, and His Blood *true drink*[2] (John vi. 55), at this last Passover He gathered up in action all that He had then expressed in words. For, when He gave the Bread to His Apostles, He said, *Take eat; this is My Body*, and when He gave them the Cup, He said, *This is My Blood of the Covenant.* Thus as the Jewish Passover was a feast of Redemption, so He made this transfigured Passover to be for His Church the Sacrificial Feast of an infinitely greater Redemption not of a single nation, but of the whole world[3].

ix. **Feasts on Sacrifices** were common alike to the Jews and to the Gentile nations. They were means of ratifying covenants between God and man. They were especially characteristic of the peace-offerings of the Jews, and indicated that what had separated the sacrificer from

[1] At the same Passover He had uttered in the hearing of the deputation from the Sanhedrin, Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν, John ii. 19. The sign is one of the most remarkable. As a Rabbi He answers the Rabbis. The words indicate a destruction, which comes from dissolution, from the breaking of that which binds the parts into a whole, or one thing to another. They "spring from an immeasurable depth. They illustrate domains then completely unexplored by any other consciousness than His own." Godet *in loc.*

[2] Ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθής ἐστι βρῶσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθής ἐστι πόσις, John vi. 55. The words employed are such as it is inconceivable that any mere man could have uttered. On the lips of any merely human teacher they have no meaning whatever. Nowhere in any literature, not even in the luxuriant imagery of the East, do we find an instance of a teacher speaking of the reception of his doctrine under so astounding a metaphor as "eating his flesh" and "drinking his blood."

[3] "The communion of the Paschal lamb, as the characteristic offering of the Old Law, had formed the foundation and centre of the whole sacrificial system of the Old Testament." Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, i. p. 58. E.T. 1877.

Jehovah was now covered and cancelled, that the Most High now welcomed him to His table, and in this feast gave him a pledge of reconciliation and restoration to His favour[1]. So at this sacrificial feast of the New Covenant, our Lord assures us that He has become *our peace* (Eph. ii. 14; Col. i. 20), and invites us to receive "the spiritual food" of His own precious Body and Blood. At this Holy Table we are His guests, and receive Him under the earthly veils of Bread and Wine. The old Passover was a Feast upon a Sacrifice, the Holy Eucharist is a Feast upon a Sacrifice. "The one on the lamb; the other on the Lamb of God. The one true; the other true. The one carnally true; the other spiritually, and, therefore, even *more* true[2]." And thus in this holy Feast "we are one with Christ, and Christ with us," and "the Bread, which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ."

x. **Transubstantiation.** The exact way in which Christ is present at this sacred Feast, and gives His Body and Blood to the faithful communicant, has occasioned great controversy. The early Church[3] did not attempt to explain the Mystery. The doctrine of the manner of Christ's Presence in the Holy Eucharist, and the precise

[1] Compare the scene on Sinai, when Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu with the seventy elders, after the ratification of the covenant between Jehovah and His people by solemn sacrifices and sprinkling of blood, *ate and drank* in His presence at a covenant feast, and therein received a pledge of reconciliation and pardon (Exod. xxiv. 9—11; Heb. ix. 19, 20).

[2] Bp. Browne *On the Articles*, p. 713, ed. 1854.

[3] The change in the elements through consecration was in the oldest times expressed by the simplest terms, "It is," "It becomes"; or in prayer to God, "consecrate," "perfect," "appoint," "make." The Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, and others following it, use the words, "change by Thy Spirit." There are also other more emphatic yet rare words, occurring once or twice only in each Father who uses them, "transmute," "transelement," "transfashion," "transfigure." Μεταποιεῖσθαι is once used by S. Gregory of Nyssa, and once by Theodoret, μεταρρυθμίζειν and μετασκενάζειν, each by S. Chrysostom; "transfiguro," twice by S. Ambrose; "transfero," in the Gallican Sacramentary.

nature of the relation in which the consecrated Elements and the Body and Blood of Christ stand to one another, never came into serious debate, and thus never were the subject of authoritative definition. Men were content with the blessing, and did not care to define it. That Christ was present in the Sacrament, that in that sacred Feast He fed the faithful with the precious food of His own most blessed Body and Blood, in this all the Fathers of the Early Church were agreed[1]. As yet however, there was but little speculation as to what was meant by this Presence.

xi. **Paschasius Radbert.** But matters could not always continue in this state, and in the ninth century Paschasius Radbert, a learned monk[2], afterwards Abbot of New Corbey, well skilled in all the theological learning of his age, put forth a treatise *On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.* In this he maintained that by virtue of the priestly consecration and the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, the material elements were so transformed as to retain no more than an appearance ("figura") of their natural substance, being truly, though invisibly, replaced by Christ Himself in every way the same as He was born and crucified[3]. This view was opposed by another monk of Corbey, Ratramnus[4], who put forth a counter treatise at the request of the Emperor Charles the Bald. He favoured a real, while he disbelieved in a corporal, or material presence in the Eucharist. The controversy slumbered during the whole of the tenth century, but was revived by Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers, A.D.

[1] See Abp. Trench, *Mediæval Church History*, p. 182.

[2] He was born A.D. 786, and died A.D. 865. See Hardwick's *Middle Age*, p. 166.

[3] Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 166; Neander, iv. pp. 210 sqq., E. T. 1852; Gieseler, *Church History*, ii. pp. 284 sqq., E. T. 1859.

[4] For his connection with the Predestinarian Controversy, see Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 163.

1040, who re-asserted the view expounded by Ratramnus. This exposed him to much opposition, and he was twice compelled to sign a formula of faith, in which the *physical* conversion of the Elements was stated in the most revolting terms[1]. The view, to which he subscribed, that Christ's Body is "sensibly" present in the Eucharist, that it is broken by the priest, and this *not sacramentally only, but really and without any figure*, was the doctrine generally held by the people and also by many of the clergy at the era of the Reformation[2].

xii. **The Scholastic Doctrine.** On the overthrow of Berengarius the views he opposed gained complete possession of the leading teachers of the West. As years went on the exact intention of the phrase "transubstantiation[3]" was much discussed by the Schoolmen. They taught that every object we can take cognizance of by the senses possesses two invariable properties (i) the "accidents[4]" or

[1] In A.D. 1059 he subscribed to a formula which stated "verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse, et *sensualiter* in solo sacramento, sed in veritate, manibus sacerdotum tractari, *frangi et fidelium dentibus* atteri." Lanfranc, *Opp.* p. 233. The Formula which he signed in A.D. 1079 ran "Corde credo et ore confiteor, panem et vinum, quæ ponuntur in altari, per mysterium sacræ orationis et verba nostri Redemptoris *substantialiter* converti in veram et propriam vivificatricem Carnem et Sanguinem Jesu Christi Domini nostri, et post consecrationem esse verum Corpus Christi...et verum Sanguinem Christi, qui de latere Ejus effusus est, non tantum per signum et virtutem Sacramenti, sed *in proprietate naturæ et veritate substantiæ*." Lanfranc, *ut supr.*

[2] See the form of recantation framed by Cardinal Pole and signed by Sir John Cheke. Strype's *Life of Sir John Cheke*, p. 123.

[3] Transubstantiation is formed from (α) trans, which=(1) *across, beyond*, and (2) in composition denotes a *change* from one state to another, as in the words "transform," "transfigure," and (β) substantia, which denotes not what we ordinarily understand by substance, but what is expressed by the Greek *οὐσία, essence.* Hence the Greek word *μετουσίωσις* corresponding to transubstantiation. The word is first found in an exposition of the Canon of the Mass by Peter Damian, A.D. 988—1072, cap. vii. It first appears as a term accepted and recognised by the Roman Church at the fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.

[4] Accident, from accidere *to fall, to happen*, denotes (i) anything that happens, any *occurrence*, or *incident;* (ii) that which is present by chance, and therefore non-essential; *a property* or *a quality not essential to our conception of a substance; an attribute;* (iii) in Scholastic Theology the ma-

external properties, as shape, form, colour, size, material, and (ii) the "substance," the internal, invisible essence, the true reality, of which the "accidents" were the outward clothing. Their doctrine, a refinement of the theory of Paschasius, was that, after consecration, while the accidents remained the same as before, the invisible substance or essence of the bread and wine was transfigured or transubstantiated into the substance or essence of the Body and Blood of Christ[1]. Thus transubstantiation was defined at the Council of Trent, and this is the definition of the Roman Church held now.

xiii. **The First Objection** which the Article makes to this refinement on the teaching of Paschasius is that it "cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture." When He instituted the Sacrament, our Lord did not say "This represents My Body," or "This has the power and efficacy of My Body," but "This is My Body." Thus He indicates a deep mystery, whereby what was bread is called and is His Body, and what was the cup is called and is His Blood. And yet S. Paul uses the word "Bread" and the word "the Cup" to describe these Elements after consecration. He says to the Corinthians, *As often as ye eat this Bread and drink the Cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come* (1 Cor. xi. 26). The bread is still called "the Bread."

terial qualities remaining in the Sacramental Bread and Wine after consecration. Comp. Wyclif, A.D. 1380, *Eng. Wks.*, "No man durste seye til nou þat *accident* is Goddis body, for þis newe worde may haue no ground"; Caxton, *Golden Leg.*, "Whan the breed is converted into the precious body of our Lord *the accidents* abyden"; Lydgate, *Pylg. Sowle*, A.D. 1483, "Quantitie is an *accident* only appropred to bodylie thynges."

[1] "Sancta hæc Synodus declarat, per consecrationem panis et vini conversionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, et totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis Ejus; quæ conversio convenienter et proprie a sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata." *Concil. Trident.*, Sess. xiii., cap. iv.

The cup is still called "the Cup." No annihilation of the outward sign is hinted at or indicated.

xiv. **The Second Objection** taken in the Article is that the doctrine "overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament[1]." A Sacrament, as we have seen, consists of two parts, the outward visible sign and the inward spiritual grace. There must exist in a valid Sacrament the "signum," the sign, and the "res significata," or thing signified. Now if after consecration the outward form is virtually annihilated, and ceases to have any real existence, the thing signified alone remains, and the nature of a sacrament is overthrown, and the visible sign of that which is invisible vanishes.

xv. **The Third Objection** is that it has "given rise to many superstitions." This alludes to the superstitions, which a gross and material view of the physical change after consecration too often produced. Such, for instance, were the stories of the appearances of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament as a little child[2]; of drops of blood flowing, when Odo, Archbishop of Canterbury, broke the Host; and other instances alluded to by Ælfric in his Homilies[3]. Such ideas were the result of a coarse and unguarded propagation of the views set forth by the teaching of Paschasius, which led to the idea that such appearances were appearances of the Body of our Lord under such conditions as were realized during His earthly life.

[1] "Naturam sacramenti evertit." Evertere = (i) *to turn out, to drive out;* (ii) *to overthrow*, as "silvis evertere pinum," Virg. *Georg.* i. 256; (iii) *to overthrow, completely destroy*, as "evertere funditus amicitiam," Cic. *Fin.* ii. 25; "evertere...disciplinam militarem," Livy viii. 30. The English translation "overthroweth" is rendered in some MSS. "perverteth." See Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, p. 313, ed. 1859.

[2] As to Plecgils, a priest of the fifth century, see Blunt's *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, Art. *Transubstantiation.*

[3] Bp. Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 553.

xvi. **The View advanced in the Article.** In primitive times, as we have said, we trace no such subtle speculations as these, we find no exact statement as to the nature and extent of the change effected by consecration in the Holy Eucharist. Men were content to maintain a reverent reserve in respect to so great a mystery. They believed that in the words of S. Justin Martyr, the Eucharist is no longer "common bread or common drink"; that in this sacred Feast Christ feeds us with the precious food of His Body and Blood, but they did not attempt to define the mode or the manner of His Presence[1]. Similarly cautious and guarded is the language of the Article. It states that the Body of Christ is "given, taken, and eaten in the Supper," and herein it agrees with the language of the Catechism[2]. But repudiating the idea of a *corporal* presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood, it affirms that He is given and received "only after an heavenly and spiritual manner." Christ's Body is now a glorified Body[3], and no longer subject to the conditions of its earthly state. *Flesh and blood*, writes S. Paul, *cannot inherit the kingdom of God* (1 Cor. xv. 50). Any Presence of Christ, therefore, in the Blessed Sacrament, must have reference to His glorified, heavenly, Body. But His Presence is not *less*

[1] "All things considered, and compared with that success which truth hath hitherto had by so bitter conflicts with errors in this point, shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how?" Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lxvii. 3.

[2] Compare the words of the Church Catechism, "What is the inward part or thing signified? The Body and Blood of Christ, which are *verily and indeed* (vere et reipsa)," i.e., truly and actually, not in a mere metaphorical sense, not only in a figure, "*taken and received* (sumuntur et percipiuntur) by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The use of the word "taken" implies that what is received has its existence apart from the recipient.

[3] "His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, His soul and body not on earth but in heaven only.... Yet as the manhood of Christ may after a sort be everywhere said to be present, because that Person is everywhere present, from whose divine substance manhood nowhere is severed; so the same universality of presence may likewise seem in another respect appliable thereunto, namely, by *cooperation* with Deity, and that in *all things*." Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* v. lv. 7, 8.

but *more* real[1] because it is spiritual and ineffable, and passes all human comprehension[2]. The Article does not, to use the words of Bishop Guest[3], "exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." It simply refuses to define what passes all definition, and what it finds a mystery it leaves a mystery under the shadow of God's throne[4].

[1] The word "real" as applied to Presence is often confounded with the word carnal or corporal. It does not bear that meaning at all. Real, from the Latin *realis*, is derived from *res*, a thing. It denotes (i) *actually being* or *existing*, not fictitious or imaginary. Compare Milton, *Par. Lost:*

"Whereat I waked, and found
Before mine eyes all *real*, as the dream
Had lively shadowed":

it denotes (ii) *true*, *genuine*, not artificial or counterfeit, as a *real* fact; (iii) as a law-term, *real* estate, *real* property, e.g. lands, tenements as opposed to personal or moveable property. A real presence denotes the presence of a reality, a true, actual presence as opposed to an untrue, counterfeit, unreal presence.

[2] That the compilers of the Articles did not reject the Scholastic theory of Transubstantiation because they shrank from a full belief in the Sacramental Presence is clear from many statements of the leading divines of the sixteenth century. Thus Bishop Ridley writes, "The true Church of Christ doth acknowledge a Presence of Christ's Body in the Lord's Supper, but yet sacramentally and spiritually, not carnally or corporally giving life, and in that respect really, that is, according to His benediction, giving life." Ridley's *Works*, *P. Society*, p. 236; again he writes "That heavenly Lamb is (as I confess) on the Table; but by a spiritual presence, and not after any corporal presence," *Works*, p. 249; "Thus much we must be sure to hold," we read in the Second Book of the Homilies, "that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent"; First Pt. of the Sermon *concerning the Sacrament*, p. 378, ed. 1802. Again Bishop Jewel, the chief writer of the Second Book of Homilies, says, "Diserteque pronunciamus, in Cœna credentibus vere exhiberi Corpus et Sanguinem Domini, carnem Filii Dei," Jewel, *Apologia*, Pt. II. xi. i.

[3] Bishop Guest, who was chiefly concerned in penning this Article, writes, "I told the Bishop of Gloucester plainly that the word only in the aforesaid Article did not exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." Guest's Letter to Cecil, Dec. 22, 1566. So also Bishop Andrewes writes, "As to the Real Presence we are agreed; our controversy is as to the *mode* of it. The Presence we believe to be real as you do. As to the mode we define nothing rashly, nor anxiously investigate, any more than in Baptism we enquire how Christ's Blood washes us; any more than in the Incarnation of Christ we ask how the human is united to the divine nature in One Person." Bp. Andrewes, *Responsio*, p. 13; comp. his *Sermon on the Resurrection*, ii. p. 302.

[4] One most powerful argument against Transubstantiation is found in the use made of the Blessed Sacra-

xvii. **The Last Clause** of the Article deals with various points connected with the celebration of the Eucharist, such as reservation, carrying about, elevation, and adoration of the Elements. These ceremonies it affirms are no parts of Christ's original institution. They may be omitted without breaking our Lord's enactment respecting the celebration of the Sacrament. He did not ordain it *in order that* they should be observed; they are not essential to the validity of the Sacrament; and their omission leaves the whole of the original institution untouched.

xviii. **Reservation** was allowed in primitive times for the sake of carrying a portion of the consecrated Elements to the sick. Thus Justin Martyr in his First Apology, describing the celebration of the Eucharist says, "The Deacons communicate each of those present, and carry away to the absent of the blest Bread and Wine and Water[1]." Again Eusebius, near the beginning of the fourth century, tells of a man, who on his death bed sent at night for a priest to communicate him, and, the priest being ill, the Eucharist, which must have been reserved, was taken to him by a layman[2]. S. Chrysostom relates how in a tumult at Constantinople soldiers entered the place, where the holy vessels were stored, and the most Holy Blood of Christ was spilt on their garments[3]. The practice was subsequently still further developed, and resorted to in the case of long journeys by land and by sea[4]. The custom,

ment by, e.g. Theodoret, S. Gelasius, and S. Chrysostom, as an illustration of the Catholic doctrine of the Two Natures of our Lord; if Transubstantiation had been the doctrine of their day it would have supported not the Catholic, but the Monophysite view.

[1] S. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 65.

[2] Euseb. *Eccl. Hist.* vi. 44.

[3] S. Chrysost. *Epist. ad Innoc.* 3; see Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* ii. 1787.

[4] Travellers by sea had the body and blood of the Redeemer with them, Greg. Mag. *Dial.* iii. 36. "Becket carried the Sacrament round his neck on the occasion of his going in search of Henry II. When the ordeal by fire was proposed to decide whether the Pope was right in excommunicating Savonarola, his friend

however of reservation, is one of permission not of obligation, its observance forms no part of the original institution of the Sacrament, and each independent Church, as possessed of power "to decree rites or ceremonies," may adopt or disallow the practice as it may be judged to be expedient.

xix. **The Carrying about** of the Blessed Sacrament in solemn processions was a ceremony introduced into the Church during the Middle Ages. It does not exist in the orthodox Eastern Church, neither do any of the Eastern heretical Churches practise it. It is difficult to fix the date of its first[1] introduction. The Feast of Corpus Christi was instituted by Pope Urban IV. in 1264, and subsequently commanded by Clement V. in 1311, but it formed no part of the original institution or of Apostolic practice.

xx. **Elevation.** S. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians speaks of Christ as being "placarded" or "visibly held up" as crucified before the eyes of the Galatians[2] (Gal. iii. 1). This passage has sometimes been regarded as an indication of the contemporary practice of the Elevation of the Sacrament. But the custom cannot be traced back to such an age. There is no allusion to it in the early Sacramentaries[3] of Gelasius, Leo, or Gregory, or in the ancient writers[4] on the ceremonies of the Church. It is

Fr. Dominic, who was to make the fiery trial, held the Sacrament in his hand." See Bp. Forbes, *Articles*, p. 570.

[1] S. Carlo Borromeo, in the Acts of the Council of Milan, puts restrictions on the public exposition of the Blessed Sacrament. The Feast of Corpus Christi did not become universal till after the Council of Vienne in 1311.

[2] Οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος. Gal. iii. 1.

[3] In all early Oriental Liturgies an elevation of the Host by the celebrating Priest is prescribed contemporaneously with the proclamation ἅγια ἁγίοις, and before the Fraction. Thus in the Liturgy of S. James, "then he elevates the gifts and saith 'Holy things to holy persons'"; in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, "the priest, elevating the holy bread exclaims, 'Holy things for holy persons.'" But the rite took place within the Bema, while the doors were closed and the curtains drawn. The original intention, therefore, was clearly not that the Host might be adored by the people. Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 605.

[4] Roman writers on ceremonial confess their inability to find any trace

not till we come to A.D. 1136 that we find any mention made of it.

xxi. **Adoration.** In reference to this point the Article is worded very carefully and with great moderation. As it is stated in Art. xxv. that the object for which Christ ordained the Sacraments was not that they might be "gazed upon" or "carried about," so here it is laid down that the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist was not by Christ's ordinance...to be worshipped or adored. The Article deals with the adoration of the Sacrament, that is, of the Sacramental Bread and Wine there *bodily* received, or of any *Corporal* Presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood[1]. It says nothing whatever about the adoration of Christ in the Sacrament. It deals with the adoration of the outward Elements, not of Him, Who is present under these earthly veils.

of the practice in the ancient Sacramentaries, or the codices of the *Ordo Romanus*, or in any of the writers on ritual, Alcuin, Amalarius, Walafrid. There is little doubt that the custom of Elevation owes its introduction to the spread of the tenets of Berengarius in A.D. 1050, against which it was regarded as a public protest. It had little or no authoritative sanction before the 13th century. See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 606; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* xv. 5, 4.

[1] The "Black Rubric" or "Declaration of Kneeling" at the close of the Communion Service was introduced into the Second Prayer-Book of 1552, but it was removed from Q. Elizabeth's Prayer-Book. The wording of it was altered at the Caroline Settlement. On its first appearance it ran thus: "We do declare (i.e. by kneeling) no adoration is intended...unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood." On its re-introduction at the Caroline settlement it was worded, "unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood." Thus the words "Corporal Presence" take the place of "real and essential Presence." Procter, *Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 122, 139. "We allow 'Christum in Eucharistia vere præsentem, vere et adorandum'." Bp. Andrewes, *Responsio*, p. 266.

Article XXIX.

1563.	1571.
De Manducatione Corporis Christi et impios illud non manducare.	*Of the wicked which do not eate the body of Christe in the vse of the Lordes Supper.*
Impii, et fide viva destituti, licet carnaliter et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) corporis et sanguinis Christi Sacramentum, dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantæ rei Sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad judicium sibi manducant, et bibunt[1].	The wicked, and suche as be voyde of a liuelye fayth, although they do carnally and visibly presse with their teeth (as Saint Augustine sayth) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: yet in no wyse are the[y] partakers of Christe, but rather to their condemnation do eate and drinke the signe or Sacrament of so great a thing.

i. **Connection.** After stating in the preceding Article "that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ," the xxixth Article proceeds to speak of "the Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith," who yet draw near to this Holy Feast. At a time when it was the great aim of those, who drew up the Articles, to emphasize the idea of Communion, it was natural to fear that people, "who would not part with their sins, would thrust themselves into holy things to their own hurt."

ii. **History.** The xxixth Article was altogether wanting in 1553, and did not appear in the early printed

[1] *From the Parker Latin MS. of* 1563.

copies of the draft of 1563. It owes its origin to Archbishop Parker, and we may conclude that it was probably composed in 1563[1], but was not absolutely and fully adopted till 1571. In drawing it up, the Archbishop took his statements almost word for word from a passage in S. Augustine's Commentary on the sixth Chapter of S. John's Gospel[2]. But the Benedictine editors[3] of that great Father's works deemed portions of the passage to be interpolated, and the fairness of the quotation was called in question by Cecil[4], Elizabeth's minister, at an interview between him and Parker, and the passage was verified by reference to the treatise, out of which it was taken.

iii. **The Title.** Though the Title forms no part of the Article yet it deserves attention. It is, then, to be observed that it does not say that the wicked "receive not," but that they "eat not" the Body of Christ "in the use of the Lord's Supper." Now the expression "eat not the Body of Christ" is taken from the sixth Chapter of S. John's Gospel, and imports that the wicked eat not in such a way, that they "thereby dwell in Christ and Christ in them," they neither eat nor drink of the Bread and Wine

[1] It is found in the Parker Latin MS. of 1563, and in the Parker English MS. of 1571, also in the Latin edition of 1571, printed by John Day, and published by the Queen's authority.

[2] In the Latin Parker MS. there is a marginal reference "super Joann. Tract 26," and also in a unique copy of the English Articles of 1571. Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 315, ed. 1859.

[3] The passage, as it runs in S. Augustine, is as follows: "Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat (*spiritaliter*) Carnem Ejus, nec bibit Ejus Sanguinem (*licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi*), sed magis tantæ rei Sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit." The parts deemed interpolations by the Benedictine edition are enclosed in brackets, and are put in italics. The clauses are found in the Commentaries of Bede and Alcuin on S. John.

[4] Cecil's gentleness in dealing with the adherents of the Old Learning, whether Romish or Lutheran, is well known. For the letter to Cecil by Bishop Guest, May 1571, which may have occasioned this interview between the Minister and the Archbishop, see *Bishop Guest, Articles xxviii., xxix.*, by the Rev. G. F. Hodges, p. 24, quoted from *the State Papers, Domestic*, Elizabeth, 1571, Vol. lxxv., No. 36.

for any purpose or effect unto which Christ ordained these Elements to be received[1].

iv. **Analysis.** This consideration of the Title prepares us for the Article itself, which states that

(α) "The Wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ;

(β) But rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing."

v. **The Phraseology** here used is very important. It is *not* said that the wicked are not partakers of the Body and Blood of Christ; it *is* said that "in no wise are they partakers of Christ." The expression "partakers of Christ" occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the writer says, *We are become partakers of Christ*[2], *if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end* (Heb. iii. 14), and in another place he speaks of *those who were once*

[1] In S. John vi. 50, our Lord says, *This is the Bread, which cometh down out of heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die;* in vi. 51, He says, *If a man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever;* and in vi. 54, *He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life.* R.V. "To eat, therefore, the Body of Christ is used of such eating, whereby a man dwelleth in Christ and Christ in Him; whereby he shall 'live for ever,' whereby he hath eternal life, and liveth by Christ, as Christ liveth by the Father." Pusey, *Real Presence*, p. 255. "Nowhere in Scripture do we hear of an eating and drinking of the true Body and Blood of our Lord which is not profitable. The Body and Blood are of that nature, that they are in the reason of the case, by the simple fact of being eaten and drunk, beneficial; and no such thing is contemplated as a *real* eating of them, which is not a *beneficial* eating of them also." Professor Mozley, *Lectures and Theol. Papers*, p. 205.

[2] Μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γεγόναμεν. *Participes Christi effecti sumus.* Vulg. "We have been united with Him and so we have been made now to partake in the fulness of His life." S. Chrysostom paraphrases it, Μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ, φησίν, ἐν ἐγενόμεθα ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτός, εἴπερ, αὐτὸς μὲν κεφαλὴ σῶμα δὲ ἡμεῖς, συγκληρονόμοι καὶ σύσσωμοι. "In eo etiam participamur, quia Corpus et Sanguinem Ejus sumimus ad redemptionem nostram." Primasius, quoted by Bp. Westcott *in loc.*

enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost[1] (Heb. vi. 4). To be a *partaker of the Holy Ghost* is to have a share of Him, Who is the gift of God, shed abroad in the hearts of all those, who are His by the Spirit; it is to be a partaker of Christ Himself. Now the impious and wilfully impenitent, so long as they remain such, are *the enemies of the Cross of Christ*, they belong to those who are said to *crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame* (Heb. vi. 6). Clearly, so long as they remain impenitent and void of a living faith, they are not and cannot be "partakers of Christ." And there was much reason in the times of Archbishop Parker to warn those, who would thrust themselves into holy things, that to approach the Lord's Table in a spirit of unbelief, contempt and disobedience, was to expose themselves to grievous risk; that they might "carnally and visibly press with their teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ[2]," but could not be "partakers of Christ." They might receive the "Sacramentum;" they could not receive the "Virtus Sacramenti[3]."

[1] Μετόχους γενηθέντας Πνεύματος ἁγίου. "The compound expression (μετόχους γενηθέντας), as distinguished from μετασχόντας (Heb. ii. 14), marks more than the simple fact of participation (Heb. vii. 13; 1 Cor. x. 17). It brings out the fact of a personal character gained; and that gained in a vital development." Bp. Westcott *in loc.*

[2] "The spiritual food of our Lord's Body and Blood, cannot be eaten except spiritually...But if it cannot be eaten except spiritually, how does the carnal man supply the spiritual medium and instrumentality of eating? The carnal man has only the natural mouth and teeth to apply; this is all he has; but this is totally irrelevant to spiritual food." Professor Mozley, *Lectures and Theol. Papers*, p. 205.

[3] It is the Virtus Sacramenti which the unworthy and impenitent do not receive. "Aliud est Sacramentum, aliud Virtus Sacramenti. Quam multi de altari accipiunt et moriuntur, et accipiendo moriuntur." S. Aug. *Tract. in Joann.* xxvi. 11. In theological language the word *Sacramentum* has two senses: it may mean (i) the "outward and visible sign," the bare *signum*, (ii) the *signum* together with the *res significata*, not the *Virtus Sacramenti* the "wholesome effect or operation." It is in the *second* and more comprehensive sense that the word is here used by S. Augustine.

vi. **The Words of S. Paul,** when he found it necessary to correct the disorders that had crept into the Church at Corinth as regards the celebration of the Lord's Supper, support the language of the Article. The Apostle writes, *Whosoever shall eat the Bread or drink*[1] *the Cup of the Lord unworthily*[2]*, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord,.....he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgement unto himself, if*[3] *he discern not the Body*[4] (1 Cor. xi. 27, 29). It is plain from this that the Apostle draws a distinction between a worthy and an unworthy mode of approaching the Blessed Sacrament, between a reverent recognition of the presence of the Lord in this holy Feast, and a profane and irreverent attitude, which fails by its "unhallowed sense[5]" to discern the inward part of the Sacrament. The just inference from the Apostle's words is that there can be no beneficial reception[6] of the Sacrament by those who persist in living in a state of wilful sin, for to them Christ is present not to bless, but to judge.

[1] Ἢ *πίνῃ* "*or* drink," not "*and* drink," a translation not only erroneous but detrimental to the significance, of the warning. "Unworthy and irreverent partaking, whether of the one element or the other, involved the guilt of which the Apostle is about to speak,—guilt in regard of the whole blessed Sacrament; hence *τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος* in the clause that follows. Bp. Ellicott *in loc.*

[2] "Aliter quam dignum est tanta mysteria tractari." Beza.

[3] The participle is here used with a hypothetical or conditional reference. See R. Version. It is *μὴ διακρίνων* not *οὐ διακρίνων*.

[4] "Note these words, 'The Lord's BODY.' It is not here said, 'The sign or Sacrament of the Lord's Body, nor the grace or fruit of the Lord's Body, nor the memory of the Lord's Passion, but plainly, 'The Lord's Body,' to teach us that the evil men of the Church do receive Christ's Body." Bishop Guest's *Letter to Cecil*, *State Papers*, Elizabeth, 1571. "Corpus enim Domini et sanguis Domini nihilominus erat etiam illis quibus dicebat Apostolus, *Qui manducat indigne, judicium sibi manducat et bibit.*" S. Aug. *De Baptismo contra Donat.* v. 9.

[5] Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 440, E. T.

[6] "The thing offered to them is identical with that which is offered to the faithful, but they lack both the will and the power to assimilate it. Honest faith, however rudimentary, and right intention, however weak in practice, may count on receiving the Body of Christ; but the touch of positive unbelief and contempt and disobedience profanes the Sacrament." Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, pp. 300 sq., ed. 1888.

Article XXX.

1563.	1571.
De Vtraque Specie.	*Of both kindes.*
Calix Domini Laicis non est denegandus: utraque enim pars Dominici Sacramenti ex Christi institutione et præcepto, omnibus Christianis ex æquo administrari debet.	The cuppe of the Lorde is not to be denyed to the laye people. For both the partes of the Lordes Sacrament, by Christes ordinance and commaundement, ought to be ministred to all Christian men alike.

i. **The Thirtieth Article,** like the preceding one, was wanting in the series of 1553, but was introduced by Archbishop Parker in the reign of Elizabeth, at the revision in 1563[1].

ii. **Object.** Its object is to vindicate for the laity a right to Communion in Both Kinds, to the Cup as well as to the Bread. The custom which had arisen in the Western Church of administering to the laity only the consecrated Host, while the Priest alone[2] partook of the Chalice, had given rise to much controversy long before the Reformation. It was indeed the cause of terrible wars, especially in Bohemia, where the people rose in a body and protested desperately against being deprived of a part of the Sacrament, which Christ had intended for all alike.

[1] See above, p. 20. Compare Article x. of the Eleven Articles of 1559, Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 128, 396, ed. 1859.

[2] The Sacerdos *conficiens*, the Priest who consecrates and dispenses. Other Priests present were Sacerdotes *non conficientes*.

iii. **Analysis.** The Article brings out two main points:—

(i) *A statement;*
"The Cup[1] of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people:"

(ii) *A justification of the statement;*
"For both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament[2], by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike."

iv. **The Original Institution.** That the Chalice was intended for the laity may be proved, (i) from the original institution of the Sacrament as recorded in the New Testament, and (ii) from the writings of the early Fathers. In the account of the original institution we are told that the words of our Lord to His Apostles were

Drink ye all of this[3];

and that they complied with His command is clear, for we read in the Gospel of S. Mark

And they all drank of it[4].

Here we might suppose the argument was at an end. It is urged, however, that the Apostles, forming a consecrated body of Priests, might receive the Chalice, and so the command does not apply to the laity. But upon this it is to be observed that even if we assume that the Apostles were at the time all Priests, the account of the original institution is not that our Lord received the

[1] *Calix*, from the Greek κύλιξ, in classical writers denoted a *cup* or *drinking vessel*. In Ecclesiastical writers it is confined specially to the Chalice of the Holy Eucharist.

[2] With "Calix Domini" and "dominici sacramenti," comp. 1 Cor. xi. 21, Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, and the phrases Dies Dominica; Oratio Dominica.

[3] Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, Matt. xxvi. 27. See above, p. 332 *n*.

[4] Καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, Mark xiv. 23.

Chalice and none else, but that He received and they received. Thus there is no justification for withholding the Cup not only from the laity, but even from all the Clergy, except the officiating Priest[1].

v. **Apostolic Custom.** If we ask whether, as a matter of fact, the Apostles administered to themselves and their successors in Both Kinds, and to the lay-members of the Church in One Kind only, an answer is ready to hand from the Scriptures of the New Testament. For

(α) In the Acts we find the members of the Church attending constantly on *the breaking of the bread from house to house*[2] (Acts ii. 42—46). This is a form of expression which can hardly be understood except as including lay persons;

(β) Again, it is impossible to understand how the troubles at Corinth could have originated at all, had the chalice been denied to the laity. If they had no right to it at all, how came it to pass that excesses calling for such stern rebuke from S. Paul accompanied the administration[3]? Why, again, in rebuking them does he not say that they had done wrong in receiving the Species of Wine at all? Would not such have been a simpler and more obvious way of checking these excesses? Again, what force would there have been in his argument about the heathen sacrificial feasts, *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord and the Cup of demons*[4], except the laity were permitted to drink of the chalice?

[1] See Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 735.

[2] Ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες...τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, Acts ii. 42, and κλῶντες κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, ii. 46.

[3] 1 Cor. xi. 17—34.

[4] 1 Cor. x. 21, Οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον Κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων.

Unless, therefore, we believe that the Church was mistaken from the very first, it is clear that the Apostolic administration of the Eucharist contemplated the reception of the Species alike of the Bread and of the Wine by all faithful communicants.

vi. **Patristic Testimony.** Thus Apostolic custom is opposed to reception in one kind only. What is the teaching of the Primitive Fathers? It is equally decisive. For

(α) We find Justin Martyr saying in his *Apology* that "the Deacons gave to everyone that was present of the bread, over which thanks had been offered, *and of wine mixed with water, and that they carried them also to those not present*[1];"

(β) Again, Cyprian speaks of the deacons as "offering *the Cup* to those present" at the Holy Eucharist without any intimation of a distinction of persons in so doing[2];

(γ) Once more S. Chrysostom in his Commentary on the first Epistle to the Corinthians writes, "whereas under the Old Covenant the Priests ate some things and the laymen others, and it was not lawful for the people to partake of those things of which the Priest partook, it is not so now, but one Body is blessed before all, *and one Cup*[3]."

[1] Διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι, Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. cap. lxv.

[2] "Solemnibus adimpletis *calicem* diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit." Cyp. *de Lapsis*, p. 189.

[3] Καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ὧν μετεῖχεν ὁ ἱερεύς, ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν, ἀλλὰ παντὶ ἔν σῶμα προκεῖται καὶ ἓν ποτήριον. *Hom. xiv. in* 1 *Cor.* For other quotations from S. Chrysostom to the same effect, see Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.*, Art. *Holy Communion*, i. 416.

These quotations, without multiplying others, sufficiently justify, so far as early custom is concerned, a practice which obtained in the Church without question for upwards of twelve centuries, and which the Greek Church still maintains, for she always does and always has communicated her many millions of believers in Both Kinds.

vii. **The Origin** of the practice of communicating in One Kind may be traced to the fear of spilling the Consecrated Wine at the time of administration. This led to the dipping of the Bread into the chalice, as was done in the early Church in communicating the sick, and as is still done in the Greek Church[1], or to the use of a fistula or tube, through which the Consecrated Wine might be drawn. Gradually, however, and especially in the twelfth century, the administration of the chalice began to be forbidden by many Bishops to avoid the risk of irreverence, and of spilling the Sacred Species. The change, however, was not brought about without much opposition, not only from eminent divines, but even from Ecclesiastical Councils. Thus in A.D. 1095 the Council of Clermont decreed that "all, who communicated at the altar, shall receive the Body and Blood of Christ under Both Kinds, if there be no provision to the contrary[2]." Moreover it is acknowledged by Cardinal Bona, one of the most eminent liturgical writers of the Roman Communion, that "the faithful always and in all places, from the beginning of the Church till the twelfth century, were used to communicate under the Species of Bread and Wine[3]." Nay, even the Council of

[1] See Article *Fistula* in Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.*

[2] Canon xxviii. Conc. Clermont. The Third Council of Braga, A.D. 675, condemns those who were accustomed "intinctam Eucharistiam populis pro complemento Communionis porrigere."

[3] "There is no gainsaying the 'Drink ye all of it,' especially as interpreted by the practice of twelve centuries." Bp Forbes *on the Articles*, p. 598.

Constance, which first decreed on June 15, 1415, the withholding of the Cup from the laity[1], allows that "Christ Himself administered in Both Kinds to His disciples, and that in the Primitive Church the Sacrament was received in Both Kinds by the people[2]." The responsibility for introducing so great a change must lie with those who chose to violate a custom, which has on its side a prescription of twelve centuries, and which was never disputed in the primitive ages of the Church[3].

[1] "Semper enim et ubique, ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum, sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles: cœpitque paulatim ejus sæculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo interdicentibus ob periculum irreverentiæ et effusionis." Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* ii. 18, n. 1, quoted by Bingham, *Eccl. Antiqq.* xv., v. 1.

[2] Concil. Constant. Sess. xiii.

[3] Even Pope Gelasius lays it down that people "should either partake of the Sacraments in their entirety or be excluded from the entire Sacraments, because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege." See Gratian, *Corpus Jur. Can. Decr.* iii. pars; *De Consecr.* dist. ii. c. 12, quoted by Bishop Forbes, 596; Pope Leo the Great pronounces abstinence from the chalice to be a Manichæan heresy. Leo Magn. *Hom.* xli.

Article XXXI.

1563.

De unica Christi oblatione in Cruce perfecta.

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Vnde missarum sacrificia, quibus uulgo dicebatur, Sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem pœnæ aut culpæ pro uiuis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et pernitiosæ imposturæ.

1571.

Of the one oblation of Christe finished vppon the Crosse.

The offering of Christ once made, is the perfect redemption, propiciation, and satisfaction for all the sinnes of the whole worlde, both originall and actuall, and there is none other satisfaction for sinne, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priestes did offer Christe for the quicke and the dead, to haue remission of payne or gylt, were blasphemous fables, and daungerous deceits.

i. **Title and Connection.** The Latin Title of the Article has been uniform since 1553. The English Title then ran, "Of the perfeicte oblacion of Christe made upon the crosse." It forms the conclusion of the Sacramental Articles, which have all been leading up to it[1], and it states what that is, independently of which the Sacraments have no value in themselves.

ii. **Origin.** The Article is derived from the Third Article of the Second Part[2] of the Augsburg Series of 1530. That Article begins by stating emphatically that

[1] F. D. Maurice *On Art. XXXI.*

[2] The Second Part of the Augsburg Confession is based on a Series called "the Torgau Articles," drawn up by certain Lutheran Divines who met the Elector at Torgau early in 1530, in anticipation of the Augsburg Diet. See Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 22.

the Holy Eucharist, or the Mass, had never been abolished by the Lutherans, but was celebrated by them with the greatest possible reverence, only with some changes of ceremonial, and with the addition of some German Hymns for the instruction of the people[1].

iii. **Object.** The design of the Article is twofold:—

(α) To urge with all possible emphasis and clearness the uniqueness and completeness of the Sacrifice, which our Blessed Lord offered upon His Cross[2];

(β) To refute a current form of misbelief as to *the repetition* of that offering in "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priestes did offer Christe for the quicke and the dead, to haue remission of payne or gylt[3]."

iv. **Analysis.** This being its object, the Article may be thus analysed:—

(α) It declares that the offering of Christ once made[4] is "the perfect redemption, propitiation,

[1] "Falso accusantur ecclesiæ nostræ, quod Missam aboleant, retinetur enim Missa apud nos et summa reverentia celebratur. Servantur et usitatæ ceremoniæ fere omnes, præterquam quod Latinis cantionibus admiscentur alicubi Germanicæ, quæ additæ sunt ad docendum populum." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 138.

[2] "If the Sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the Sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves; we place our whole hope of salvation in it. If you understand another Propitiatory Sacrifice distinct from that as this of the Mass seems to be; if you think of any new meritorious Satisfaction to God for the sins of the world; you must give us leave to renounce your Sacrifice indeed, and to adhere to the Apostle," *By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified*, Heb. x. 14; Archbp Bramhall, *Works*, vol. i. p. 54.

[3] "What the Article speaks of here is not 'the sacrifice of the Mass,' but the habit of trusting to the purchase of Masses when dying, to the neglect of a holy life, or repentance, and the grace of God and His mercy in Christ Jesus, while in health." Pusey, *Eirenicon*, i. pp. 25, 26.

[4] "There is only one Christ, one offering for sin, one purchase of man's redemption." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 618.

and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual";

(β) It affirms that besides this One Sacrifice there is "none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone";

(γ) It repudiates the idea that the priest repeated this one Sacrifice once made in "the sacrifices of Masses," so that they could be propitiatory[1] for the quick and the dead.

v. **The First Clause** of the Article is noticeable for the number of words used to set forth the completeness and all-sufficiency of our Lord's sacrifice of Himself "once made[2]" on the altar of His Cross. It is described as "the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins[3] of the whole world, both original and actual."

(1) **The Perfect Redemption.** The first of these three figures is borrowed from the redemption of a slave, and his deliverance from bondage. The idea of His Sacrifice being a ransom is one which our Lord Himself set forth. *The Son of*

[1] "The Article was directed against the errors of those, who, by rejecting the doctrine of a sacrifice *by way of commemoration and consecration*, and not literally identical with that on the Cross, and by their crude and objectionable mode of expression countenanced the vulgar error, that the sacrifice of the Eucharist or Mass was in every respect equal to that of Christ on the Cross; and that it was in fact either a reiteration or a continuation of that Sacrifice." Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 463.

[2] Or as one MS. has it "once made for ever."

[3] Observe the fulness of the expression "pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus." Compare the Augsburg Confession, *De Missa*, "Passio Christi fuit oblatio et satisfactio, non solum pro culpa originis, sed etiam pro omnibus reliquis peccatis," and the language of Article II. (above pp. 58, 59), where it is said that Christ came "ut esset hostia, non tantum pro culpa originis, verum etiam pro omnibus actualibus hominum peccatis." So also in *The Institution of a Christian Man* we read, "Now I may boldly say and believe, as indeed I do perfectly believe, that by His Passion...Christ hath made a sufficient expiation or propitiation towards God, that is to say, a sufficient satisfaction and recompense as well for my original sin, as also for all the actual sins that ever I have committed, and from the everlasting pain due for the same." *Formularies of Faith, Henry VIII.*, p. 35.

Man, He said, *came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many*[1] (Matt. xx. 28). S. Paul also frequently uses the figure. In one place he says that our Lord *gave Himself a ransom in behalf of all*[2] (1 Tim. ii. 6); in another he states that He is *our redemption* (1 Cor. i. 30); and in yet another, that in *Him we have our redemption through His Blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses* (Eph. i. 7). For man, having fallen into sin and become *the servant of sin* (John viii. 34), could not redeem himself from its guilt and consequences. He had no ransom, which he could offer to God for his sin. But what he could not pay himself, that of His "tender love towards mankind[3]" God the Father gave His only-begotten Son to pay for man, and out of the same "tender love" the Son consented to pay it for man, and constituted Himself man's surety. To undertake this work of unimaginable condescension He Himself "became Man," and in man's nature lived a life of perfect

[1] Compare also Mark x. 45, Ὁ *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι, καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.* This and the parallel in S. Matthew are the only two passages where the word λύτρον occurs in the Gospels. But several words group themselves round this idea of λύτρον, *a ransom.* Thus we have (i) the verb λυτροῦν=*to ransom* (Luke xxiv. 21); (ii) the substantive λυτρωτής=a *ransomer* or *redeemer* applied to Moses (Acts vii. 35); (iii) λύτρωσις=*the act of ransoming* or *redemption* (Luke i. 68; ii. 38), and this is applied in Heb. ix. 12, to *the eternal redemption* wrought out by Christ, *αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὑράμενος.*

[2] Δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, 1 Tim. ii. 6, and compare 1 Pet. i. 18.

[3] "To the Jews of our Lord's day the idea of a 'ransom' was quite familiar, and the Law had regulated ransoms with much minuteness, whether for the redemption of a slave (Lev. xxv. 47—49), the life of the firstborn child (Num. xviii. 16), or the possession of an inheritance (Lev. xxv. 25—27). Ransoms were usually paid in money, but in a certain large class of cases the sacrifice of the life of one creature redeemed another from death (Exod. xiii. 13; xxxiv. 20; Num. xviii. 15)." Dr Dale, *The Atonement,* p. 76.

and absolute obedience to His Father's will, and offered up on the Cross that perfectly unblemished life as an all-sufficient "ransom" for many[1], and so redeemed all mankind alike from the power and from the consequences of sin.

(2) **The Perfect Propitiation.** The second figure employed is that of a Sin-offering or Propitiation. The Greek word thus translated, Ἱλασμός, only occurs in the writings of S. John. *Christ*, says that Apostle, *is the propitiation for our sins*[2] (1 John iv. 10). The term is specially applicable to our Lord's work upon the Cross, because it is He, Who, as the all-perfect sacrifice, has covered or expiated the sin of the world. The idea is brought out in several passages. Thus, when the Baptist sees our Lord coming up from the scene of His temptation, he exclaims, *Behold, the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world* (John i. 29, 36). When our Lord gives to His Apostles the Cup at the institution of the Holy Eucharist, He says, *This is My Blood of the Covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins* (Matt. xxvi. 28). By this He intimated that He was

[1] See the Collect for the Sunday next before Easter. "The freedom of the Father's gift of His blessed Son, and the freedom of the Son's self-oblation, are insisted on in Holy Scripture." Liddon, *University Sermons*, First Series, p. 243.

[2] Αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, 1 John ii. 2; ἱλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, 1 John iv. 10. The word ἱλασμός is formed from ἵλεως = *propitious* (Matt. xvi. 22; Heb. viii. 12), whence come also (i) the verb ἱλάσκεσθαι, which means (*a*) *to be propitious towards one* (Luke xviii. 13), (*b*) *to make propitiation for one* (Heb. ii. 17); (ii) the substantive ἱλαστήριον, which denotes (*a*) *the mercy-seat* of the ark, Χερουβὶμ δόξης κατασκιάζοντα τὸ ἱλαστήριον (Heb. ix. 5), (*b*) *a propitiation*, ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (Rom. iii. 25).

about to be a sin-offering, and His Blood was about to be shed for the remission of sins. The oblation He offered was not the arbitrary substitution of one innocent Man for a guilty race[1]. He, the Eternal Son of God, Himself became Man, and so, when He suffered upon the Cross, our Nature suffered in Him[2], for all humanity was not only represented by but gathered up in Him. By the offering up of His sinless Self, *He bare our sins in His own Body on the tree* (1 Pet. ii. 24), and by the transcendent merit of His sacrifice He made expiation for the sins of entire humanity.

(3) **The Perfect Satisfaction.** The third term employed in the Article is one which is not found in the Greek Testament. Satisfaction, from the Latin *satisfactio*, is a word used in the processes of Roman civil law[3], and in Classical Latin denoted the liquidation of a debt, or the offering an apology for some wrong done[4]. Employed first as an ecclesiastical expression

[1] "Our Redeemer cannot be substituted for man; He *is* Man. One thing cannot be put in the stead of another unless it distinctly is another. But our Lord is not another. He has made Himself one with us. He has gathered us up into Himself." Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 208, Ed. 1889.

[2] When *He died for all*, then, in the words of S. Paul, οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον, *all died* in Him, 2 Cor. v. 15. "Though God is the Author of the Atonement, and without Him fallen humanity would have been unable to offer it, yet it was made by Man, acting in the true conditions of man's nature." Ibid. p. 209. "By offering Himself upon the Cross, He maintained, even through death, the fellowship of humanity with God." Westcott, *Incarnation and Common Life*, p. 377, Ed. 1893.

[3] "Satisfactio pro solutione est." Ulpian, *Dig.* xlvi. 3. 52.

[4] Comp. Cæsar *Bell. Gall.* vi. 9, "Cæsar Ubiorum *satisfactionem* accepit"; *Bell. Gall.* i. 41, "Eorum *satisfactione* accepta." See also the first Exhortation in the Communion Service, "And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God, but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them; being ready to make restitution and *satisfaction*, according to the uttermost of your powers."

by Tertullian, it was afterwards greatly developed by S. Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury[1]. He lays it down that either punishment or satisfaction must follow every sin; that man's sin was so great that God alone could pay the debt he owed; therefore One must pay it Who is God and Man. Hence arose the necessity for the Incarnation. But the Incarnation itself was not all. The life of spotless obedience which followed, and the Death, by which that life of obedience was crowned, paid in infinitely superabundant measure the debt, which man owed to the Justice and Holiness of God[2]. Thus "the infinite worth of the Son of God[3]," dying for man and in man's nature, wrought out a perfect satisfaction for human sin, and availed to do that for man, which he alone and unaided could not have done for himself.

vi. **The Second Clause** of the Article asserts that besides this offering of Christ there can be none other satisfaction for sin. Offered by the Son of God Himself, this Sacrifice stands absolutely alone in the world. It is singular and unique as regards (i) *the Victim*, the spotless Lamb of God; as regards (ii) *the act*, His voluntary sub-

[1] The word "satisfaction" occurs in the Collect for the 4th Sunday in Advent, and in the Communion Office we assert that by His one oblation of Himself once offered our Lord has made "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and *satisfaction*" for the sins of the whole world.

[2] "Ipse sponte sustinuit mortem, non per obedientiam deserendi vitam, sed propter obedientiam servandi justitiam, in qua tam fortiter perseveravit ut inde mortem incurreret." S. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, i. 9.

[3] Compare the words of Hooker, "No person was born of the Virgin but the Son of God, no person but the Son of God baptized, the Son of God condemned, the Son of God, and no other person, crucified; which one only point of Christian belief, *the infinite worth of the Son of God*, is the very ground of all things believed concerning life and salvation by that which Christ either did or suffered as Man in our behalf." *Eccl. Pol.* v. 52, 3.

mission to death for man; and as regards (iii) *the result*, the accomplishment by Him of a perfect expiation of all the sins, both original and actual, of entire humanity. This one Sacrifice of the Son of God was offered once for all[1]. This is the point, on which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews insists so strongly, when he says that every priest under the Law *standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, the which can never take away sins*[2]*: but He, when He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God*[3] (Heb. x. 11, 12). These words make it clear that the Sacrifice of Christ was efficacious for ever, and through all time, and is incapable of repetition, that once made, it lives on in heaven, and our Ascended Lord pleads it, generation after generation, for each one of our sinful race. It cannot be denied that the language of this passage from the Epistle fully justifies the anxiety manifested in the Article that nothing should seem to overshadow, or interfere with, or supplement the meritoriousness of the One Sacrifice of our Lord upon the Cross, to the merits of which He Himself adds nothing[4].

[1] It was the *oblatio unica*, the offering of Christ *once made, semel facta*, "for all the sins of the whole world, and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone," *neque præter illam unicam est ulla alia*. "What ought to be more certain and known to all Christian people, than that Christ died *once*, and *but once*, for the redemption of the world?" Cranmer, *Answer to Gardiner*, p. 366, sect. 393, Parker Soc.

[2] Αἵτινες οὐδέποτε δύνανται περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίας, *which are such that they can never take away sin*, Lat. *auferre peccata*. The expressive word περιελεῖν expresses the stripping off the terrible robe of sin, which man has woven round himself.

[3] Οὗτος δὲ μίαν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν προσενέγκας θυσίαν, εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, O. L. *una oblata hostia in sempiterno sedit*; Vulg. *hic autem unam offerens hostiam in sempiternum*. "The sacrifice was efficacious for ever, through all time, being appropriated by each believer. The connexion of εἰς τὸ διηνεκές with the following ἐκάθισεν (*for ever sat down*) is contrary to the usage of the Epistle; it weakens the contrast with ἕστηκεν; and it imports a foreign idea into the image of the assumption (ἐκάθισεν) of royal dignity by Christ." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

[4] Hence we can understand the emphasis with which Bullinger says in his Decades of Sermons, published in 1550, and dedicated to Edward VI., "Itaque relinquitur jam indubitatum Christum Dominum *plenariam* esse propitiationem, satisfactionem, hostiamque ac victimam pro peccatis (pro

vii. **The Third Clause.** It is natural that having dealt with this point the Article should proceed to treat of "the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt." It is to be noticed that the Latin is not "Missæ sacrificium," "the sacrifice of the Mass," but "Missarum sacrificia," "the sacrifices of Masses." The expression "sacrifices of Masses," generally meant in the language of the sixteenth century "private Masses," which were said for the sake of gain, and were a source of much profit[1]. Respecting these "sacrifices of Masses" it is to be noticed that the Article is concerned with what was "commonly said" respecting them. "This," it has been truly observed, "is a strictly historical mode of speaking of what the authors of the Articles knew to have been in force in time past and saw before their eyes[2]." Now it was commonly held in the sixteenth century that the Body of Christ was once offered upon the Cross for original[3] sin, but is continually offered on

pœna, inquam, et pro culpa) *totius mundi*, et quidem *solam*. Non est enim in alio quoquam salus." Quoted in Laurence's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 299.

[1] Thus Cranmer contrasts "the many Masses every day," "the daily private Masses," "the selling Masses," with the one common Mass in a day. *Defence of the Catholic Doctrine*, v. 16. "These private Masses," he writes again, "sprang of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell Masses to the people, which caused Masses so much to increase, that every day was said an infinite number, and that no priest would receive the Communion at another priest's hand, but every one would receive it alone." Cranmer, *On the Lord's Supper*, p. 353, Parker Soc.

[2] Newman, *Tract XC.*, p. 62.

[3] This view seems to have been first propounded by Albertus Magnus, who writes, "Secunda causa institutionis hujus Sacramenti est sacrificium Altaris, contra quamdam quotidianam delictorum nostrorum rapinam; ut sicut Corpus Domini nostri semel oblatum est pro delicto originali, sic *offeratur jugiter pro nostris quotidianis delictis in altari*, et habeat in hoc Ecclesia munus ad placandum sibi Deum, super omnia legis sacramenta vel sacrificia pretiosum et acceptum." *Sermo* 1 *de Sacramento Eucharistiæ*, Alberti Magni *Opera*, tom. xii., p. 250, quoted in Denny and Lacey's *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 128. So also Ambrosius Catharinus, "inter doctores Tridentinos, eminentissimus," commenting on Heb. x., writes, "Apparet quod pro peccatis sub Novo Testamento post acceptam salutaris hostiæ in baptismo efficaciam commissis, *non habemus pro peccato*

the altar for *daily sin*, that is, that in the Mass the One Sacrifice is repeated, and that in such a sense the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice for daily sins[1]. It was also held that particular, special, Masses were more profitable to souls than "the one common Mass," and whereas the suffrages of the Church benefited those most, who most deserved to be benefited, those offered specially benefited those most for whom they were performed, specially the Masses, which were offered for departed souls[2]. Thus the idea of a propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass, valid independently of the Sacrifice of the Cross, was accentuated by these private Masses, and they naturally became a potent source of gain to the priests who offered them. This is what the Article distinctly and energetically repudiates. It affirms that it is a "blasphemous fable" to

hostiam illam, quam Christus obtulit pro peccato mundi, et pro delictis baptismum præcedentibus." See *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 130. Bp Jewel quotes Catharinus in his *Defence of the Apology*, *Works*, Vol. iii., p. 451, Parker Soc. See also the present Bp of Salisbury's pamphlet *De Validitate Ordinum Anglicanorum*, p. 9, Ed. 1894.

[1] For the preaching of this doctrine on the Continent compare the words of Luther, "Cur jam aperte concionentur, pro peccatis post Baptismum commissis Christum non satisfecisse, *sed tantum pro culpa originali*." Conciones ad 16 Joann. Comp. also the Augsburg Confession; "accessit opinio quæ auxit privatas Missas in infinitum, videlicet quod Christus sua passione satisfecerit pro peccato originis, et instituerit Missam, in qua fieret *oblatio pro quotidianis delictis, mortalibus et venialibus*. Hinc manavit publica opinio, quod Missa sit opus delens peccata vivorum et mortuorum." *Sylloge Confessionum*, p. 139. That similar doctrine was taught in England is clear from Latimer's *Sermons*: "For whereas Christ, according as the serpent was lifted up in the wilderness, so would He himself be exalted, that thereby as many as trusted in Him should have salvation; but the devil would none of that: they would have us saved by *a daily oblation propitiatory*, by a sacrifice expiatory or remissory." *Sermons*, pp. 72, 73, Parker Soc. And again in a Sermon preached before Convocation in 1536 he speaks of those, "Who preached to the people the Redemption that cometh by Christ's death to serve only them that died before His coming, that were in the time of the Old Testament, and that now since redemption and forgiveness of sins purchased by money and devised by men is of efficacy, and not redemption purchased by Christ." Latimer, *Sermons*, p. 36, ed. Parker Soc.

[2] Comp. the Augsburg Confession, "Hic cœptum est disputari, utrum una Missa dicta pro pluribus, tantundem valeat, quantum singulæ pro singulis. Hæc disputatio peperit istam infinitam multitudinem Missarum." *Sylloge Confess.*, p. 139.

teach that there is a sacrifice for sin other than the Death of Christ, and that Masses are that sacrifice[1], introducing a second and continually recurrent atonement, or, as Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, expressed it, a "new redemption[2]." It further affirms that it is a "pernicious imposture" to turn this doctrine into a means of making gain, into a source of emolument for those who celebrate these Masses.

viii. **Conclusion.** Thus the Article lays down with striking emphasis that the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross is "the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction," "not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." It affirms that the Eucharistic Sacrifice neither acquires nor possesses anything propitiatory *in itself* independently of that One Sacrifice; that it can only *apply* what was once and for all merited by that Sacrifice[3].

[1] "Art. XXXI. rejects the vulgar idea of the priest's offering *Christ* at every celebration for the living and the dead, with a view to the remission of pain or guilt, and in his *repeating* the offering of Christ made once for all (as the first part of the Article declares) every time he offers Christ, and this as again procuring each time the grace of the one offering of Christ." Prof. Friedrich in Jan. No. of *The International Theological Review*, p. 11, 1895.

[2] Compare a Sermon of his preached on the Festival of S. Peter, 1548. "For when men add unto the Mass an opinion of satisfaction or of *a new redemption*, then do they put it to another use than it was ordained for." See Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*, pp. 772, 773; Dixon, *Hist. of Ch. of England*, iii. p. 264, Ed. 1893. Gardiner could write strongly in 1531 on the all-sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice of Himself: "This is agreed," he says, "and by the Scriptures plainly taught, that the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour Christ was and is a perfect work, once consummate in perfection *without necessity of reiteration*, as *it was never taught to be reiterate*, but a mere blasphemy to presuppose it." See Abp Cranmer's Works, *On the Lord's Supper*, P. S., p. 344. The teaching of the Bishop agrees with the statement agreed to at the Bonn Conference in 1874, "The Eucharistic Celebration in the Church is not a continuous repetition or renewal of the Propitiatory Sacrifice offered once for ever by Christ upon the Cross; but its sacrificial character consists in this, that it is the permanent memorial of it, and a re-presentation and presentation on earth of that One oblation of Christ for the salvation of redeemed mankind, which according to the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 11, 12) is continuously presented in heaven by Christ, who now *appears in the presence of God for us*" (ix. 24).

[3] The idea condemned in the Article is that of the value of *many* Masses, as separate acts of sacrifice *independent of the Sacrifice of the Cross*, *the one*

As regards "the sacrifices of Masses" its language is to be understood as referring to the special doctrine which it is opposing[1], and, though strong, is not more strong than that of an Ultra-montanist Bishop of the 14th century, when he says, "Our Church is full and overfull of altars, masses, and sacrifices, and therewith in them that sacrifice it is full of homicides, sacrileges, uncleanness, and simonies, and other wickednesses, excommunications, and irregularities to the very utmost. For to this day so many masses are said for gain, or custom, or complaisance, or to cover wickednesses[2], or for their own justification, that both amongst priests and people the holy Body of the Lord is now held cheap. Whence also S. Francis willed that the brothers everywhere should be content with one Mass, foreseeing that the brethren would wish to justify them-

only-availing Sacrifice. Hence the force of the second clause, "*Wherefore* the sacrifices of Masses..." The One Sacrifice of our Lord and its all-sufficient merits live on as in our Lord's perpetual presentation of Himself in heaven. So in the Eucharistic Sacrifice "we have nothing apart from that One Sacrifice; our Eucharistic Oblation is not something in and for itself; something independent of that One Sacrifice, even while it pleaded it. Such is its union with that Sacrifice, that it is a perpetual application of its virtue; yet not as something distinct, but united with it through the oneness of that which is offered." Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, pp. 615, 616. "What we dare not say," writes Bramhall, "is that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrifice propitiatory *in itself*, by its own proper virtue and expiatory efficacy. Whatsoever power it hath, is in relation to the Sacrifice of Christ, as a means ordained to apply that to true believers." Bramhall, *Works*, Vol. v. Oxford 1845.

[1] Compare the language of the Homilies, "What dens of thieves the Churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious body and blood of Christ in the Mass, as the world was made to believe at diriges, at months' minds, in trentalls, in abbeys and chantries." Homily *On Repairing and Keeping Clean of Churches*, p. 277, Cambridge 1850.

[2] The key to the meaning of "Missarum Sacrificia" in the Article is to be found in the principle laid down by Catharinus "pro quotidianis delictis quotidianum sacrificium." "Nos," says Catharinus commenting on Heb. x. 18, "quoniam pro assiduis peccatis, quæ indies committuntur, offerimus sacrificium, nihil prohibet, immo necesse est assidue sacrificare, ac simul assidue litare; ut *quæ assidue admittuntur assiduo sacrificio expientur.*" *Speculum Hæreticorum*, fo. E iiii, Cracoviæ, 1540, quoted by Denny and Lacey, *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 129.

selves by Masses, and reduce them to a matter of gain[1] as we see done at this day[2]."

[1] "Why must a *solitary* mass, *bought for a piece of money*, performed and participated by a priest alone, in a private corner of a Church, be, not only against the sense of Scripture and the Primitive Church, but also against common sense and grammar, called a Communion, and be accounted useful to him that buys it, though he never himself receive the Sacrament, or but once a year; but for this reason, that there is *great gain*, but no godliness at all, in this doctrine?" Bp Bull's *Sermons*, *Works*, Vol. i. p. 13, Oxford 1846. "The world was made believe, that by the virtue of so many *masses*, *which were to be purchased by great endowments*, souls were redeemed out of purgatory, and scenes of visions and apparitions, sometimes of the tormented, sometimes of the delivered souls, were published in the places; which had so wonderful an effect, that in two or three centuries, endowments increased to a vast extent...the practices by which this was managed, and the effects that followed on it, we can call by no other name than downright *impostures*; worse than the making or vending false coin: when the world was drawn in by such arts to plain bargains to *redeem* their own souls, and the souls of their ancestors and posterity, *so many masses are* to be said, and forfeitures were to follow upon their not being said: thus the *masses were really the price of the lands*," Bp Burnet *On Article XXII.*, p. 251, Oxford 1845.

[2] "Nostra autem Ecclesia plena et supplena est altaribus, missis et sacrificiis, sed cum hoc plena in sacrificantibus homicidiis, sacrilegiis et immunditiis, et simoniis, et aliis sceleribus, excommunicationibus et irregularitatibus usque ad summum...Tot enim hodie dicuntur missæ quasi quæstuariæ vel consuetudinariæ vel ad complacentiam vel ad scelera cooperienda vel propriam justificationem, quod apud populum vel clerum Sacrosanctum Corpus Domini jam vilescit... Unde et almus Franciscus voluit quod in quocunque loco fratres contenti essent una missa, prospiciens fratres se velle justificare per missas, et ad quæstum eas reducere sicut videmus hodie fieri." Alvarus Pelagius, *De Planctu Ecclesiæ*, ii. 5, quoted by Pusey, *Truth and Office of the English Church*, p. 30. Alvarus Pelagius was a Penitentiary of Pope John XXII.

ARTICLE XXXII.

1563.

De Coniugio Sacerdotum.

Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconis, nullo mandato diuino præceptum est, ut aut cœlibatum uoueant, aut à matrimonio abstineant. Licet igitur etiam illis, vt cæteris omnibus Christianis, vbi hoc ad pietatem magis facere iudicauerint, pro suo arbitratu matrimonium contrahere.

1571.

Of the marriage of Priestes.

Byshops, Priestes, and Deacons, are not commaunded by Gods lawe eyther to vowe the estate of single lyfe, or to abstayne from mariage. Therefore it is lawfull also for them, as for all other Christian men, to mary at their owne discretion, as they shall iudge the same to serue better to godlynesse.

i. **Connection.** At first sight it seems a violent transition from the subject treated of in the last Article to the question of the Celibacy of the Clergy. But the transition is not really so violent as it seems[1]. The idea that Masses could be offered for the quick and dead for the remission of pain or guilt, went far to sustain the notion that the Priest was to be so far different from other men that family ties were incompatible with his position.

ii. **Title and Language.** Both the Title and Language of the Article have undergone a change. The original Latin title in 1553 was *Cælibatus ex verbo Dei præcipitur nemini*, or, in English, "The state of single life is commaunded to no man by the worde of God." This was altered in 1563 to "De Coniugio Sacerdotum" "Of the

[1] See F. D. Maurice, *Sermon on the Articles*, Art. XXXII.; Cheetham, *First Six Centuries*, p. 135.

marriage of Priestes." Moreover whereas the Article originally consisted of a single clause containing a negative statement that the state of single life without marriage is not enjoined to be vowed by Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, nor are they by God's law compelled to abstain from Matrimony; this was strengthened in 1563 by the positive additional statement that it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as it may seem to serve better to godliness[1].

iii. **Early History.** In the earliest and purest ages of the Church the idea of prohibiting Clerical marriage does not seem to have occurred to the minds of the holiest of men. Thus (*a*) S. Polycarp speaks of Valens, a Priest, and his wife, as though the fact was by no means strange[2]. (*b*) Eusebius mentions Chæremon, Bishop of Nilus, a man of great age, as flying from the Decian persecution together with his wife[3], and tells us how, during the Diocletian persecution, Bishops and Priests were urged to have pity on their wives and children, and for their sakes to offer sacrifice[4]. (*c*) Before long, however, an exaggerated esteem for celibacy crept into the Church, but it was opposed by Councils and Canons. Thus the Council of Ancyra, A.D. 314, decreed that those, who, at the time of Ordination as Deacons, declared their intention to marry, should be allowed to do so, and to remain in the Ministry, but it forbade the marriage of those, who at the time of Ordination bound themselves by vows of continence[5]. Again, the very important Council of Gangra, A.D. 314, anathematises those who hold aloof from the ministrations at the Holy Communion of a married Priest[6]. (*d*) An attempt

[1] Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, p. 128.
[2] *Epist. Polyc.*, c. xi.
[3] Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, vi. c. 42.
[4] Euseb., *Hist. Eccles.*, viii., c. 9.
[5] *Concil. Ancyr.*, Can. x.
[6] Concil. Gangr., Can. iv. A Canon of the Spanish Council of Elvira, A.D. 305, is regarded as the earliest, which enjoined on the clergy to cease cohabitation with their wives.

was indeed made to enforce celibacy on the Clergy at the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, but it was frustrated by the firmness of Paphnutius, an eminent Egyptian prelate, himself unmarried, who earnestly protested against putting so heavy a burden on the Clergy, saying it ought to suffice that they should not marry after Ordination, and should not be required to separate from their wives[1].

iv. **Later Developments.** Gradually, however, the spirit which at first exhibited itself only to be condemned in heretical communities[2], stifled the healthier feeling, and at length the liberty not only of cohabiting with but of having wives was refused, so far as Bishops were concerned, in the East and West alike. In the case of Priests the practice of the two halves of Christendom became more and more divergent. In the East Bishops were required to observe celibacy, but Priests and Deacons might live with their wives. In the West the rule against Clerical marriage grew more and more rigid[3], Spain leading the way. But there was a long struggle between the natural feelings of the Clergy and the increasing rigour of Church discipline. In 1074 Gregory VII. held a Council at Rome which condemned the marriage of Priests under the name of concubinage. Two years afterwards Archbishop Lanfranc held a synod of English Bishops at Winchester, which forbade Canons to have wives, and decreed that in future

[1] Socrat. *Hist. Eccles.*, i. c. 11; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.*, i. c. 23; Stanley's *Eastern Church*, Lect. v. 3.

[2] "The ascetic views of the Essenes, of the Montanists, of the Gnostics, and of other sects external to the Church affected more or less the Church itself." Bp Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 752.

[3] Edicts of Innocent I. in the year A.D. 405, and of Leo I. in the year A.D. 443, enjoined the strictest continence. It was far however from receiving universal obedience. "The great Church of Milan, claiming the authority of its greatest bishop, S. Ambrose, and bearing the repute of having the best clergy in Italy, was content with the ancient rule which permitted only one marriage to a cleric": Cheetham, *First Six Centuries*, p. 351; see also Milman's *Latin Christianity*, Bk. vi., c. 3.

Priests should not marry; while such Priests as lived in the country and were already married, might retain their wives[1]. Under Anselm, the successor of Lanfranc, it was finally decreed A.D. 1102 that in England no one should be ordained either Priest, Deacon, or Sub-deacon who did not profess celibacy, and this decree was confirmed by the Council of London, A.D. 1108[2].

v. **The Teaching of Scripture.** When we ask what is the teaching of Scripture on the subject we notice that in the Old Testament times the Priests were not only allowed, but encouraged to marry (Levit. xxi. 13, 14). Moreover the office even of the High-priest was made hereditary, and he was confined in the choice of a wife to a virgin belonging to his own people (Levit. xxi. 13)[3]. In the New Testament, whereas, considering the awfulness of His Mission, we might have expected that our Lord would have imitated the example of John the Baptist and inculcated the extremest asceticism, we find that He committed the keys of His Kingdom to S. Peter, who was himself a married man (Mark i. 30), and He was pleased to perform His first miracle at a marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee (John ii. 1—11). In Apostolic times we find S. Paul affirming that what was true of S. Peter was true

[1] Wilkin's *Concil.*, i. p. 367; Gieseler, *Church History*, iii. 205—207, n. 4. "The marriage of the clergy discredited on every hand, was gradually disused, and died away entirely at the middle of the thirteenth century." Hardwick, *Middle Age*, p. 241.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 387. The Council of Trent in one Canon condemns those who would permit the clergy to marry. Sess. xxiv. *De Sacr. Matrimon.* Can. ix.

[3] The priests were not so much restricted in their choice as the High-priest. They were only prohibited from marrying prostitutes and divorced women (Levit. xxi. 7). According to the spirit of the Mosaic economy, marriage was regarded as the indispensable duty of every man, nor was it imagined that it involved any drawback to the attainment of a high degree of holiness. The Essenes were the first to propound any doubts as to the propriety of marriage. Some of them avoided it altogether, others availed themselves of it under special restrictions. Similar views were held by the Therapeutæ.

also of *the other Apostles and the brethren of the Lord*[1] (1 Cor. ix. 5). Further in his Pastoral Epistles he specially directs that *bishops and deacons* should be *the husbands of one wife* (1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6), and he lays down special rules concerning the conduct of their wives (1 Tim. iii. 11), and the management of the children and household (1 Tim. iii. 4). Moreover he makes the forbidding to marry a sign of the apostasy of the latter days, and as having its origin in *the hypocrisy of men that speak lies, seared in their own conscience as with a hot iron* (1 Tim. iv. 2, 3), while on the other hand he speaks of marriage as consecrated to "such an excellent mystery, that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church" (Eph. v. 23—32). Unless, then, we are to suppose that S. Paul was mistaken from the outset, it is clear that he did not consider that estate to be unfit for the Christian Priesthood, which Christ Himself had honoured with the glory of His first miracle[2].

vi. **Special Passages.** There are, indeed, passages of Scripture which appear to give a preference to the single rather than the married life. Thus after our Lord on one occasion had condemned the too common facility of divorce, and had declared the marriage tie inviolable, the disciples remarked that, this being so, *it was not expedient to marry*[3] (Matt. xix. 10). In reply our Lord did not say it was not expedient. He simply remarked that *all men could not receive this saying* (Matt. xix. 11), and abstained from laying down any universal rule. And similarly S. Paul,

[1] "Licebat et Apostolis nubere et uxores circumducere." Tertull. *De Exhort. Castitat.*, c. 8.

[2] It must of course be remembered that the sacrifice of home made in obedience to Divine vocation, is a very strong recognition of the excellence of home-ties, for it is the essence of sacrifice to surrender by dedication what is best.

[3] Nothing could more clearly prove the revolution in thought brought to pass by Christ than this. Even the disciples feel that such a principle would make the yoke of marriage unbearable.

while he tells the Corinthians that under certain circumstances it would be good for a man to remain unmarried (1 Cor. vii. 1), yet has no idea of imposing on whole bodies of men that which his Master said all men could not receive. He admits that every man *hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that* (1 Cor. vii. 7), and declares that he has no desire *to cast a snare* on the conscience of any man, or to strain human nature beyond what it can bear (1 Cor. vii. 35).

vii. **Conclusion.** The proposition, then, that the celibacy of the Priesthood is not commanded by God's Law is absolutely primitive and Catholic. "It has ever been regarded as a matter of pure discipline, varying with the different ages and the divers necessities of the Church[1]." The Article claims for the Clergy the same freedom as is allowed the people, the same freedom as was conceded under the Jewish Law. But it by no means regards Clerical marriage as a matter of course. It leaves the ultimate decision to the individual conscience, and the question for each person to solve is whether marriage is likely or not to promote the spiritual life[2]. Our Lord spoke of continence as a Grace given to a few, and it is clear that He would commend those, who embrace voluntarily whatever privation single life involves in order to yield themselves more effectually a living sacrifice to duty and to God[3]. What the Article plainly demands is that great care and prayerful forethought should be exercised before the married state is entered upon by those in Holy Orders, who are called to be an example unto the flock which "Christ purchased for Himself with His own Blood."

[1] Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 627.

[2] Whether it will tend in the language of the Article "ad pietatem."

[3] See Mason's *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 342. 2nd Ed. 1889.

Article XXXIII.

1563.

Excommunicati uitandi sunt.

Qvi per publicam Ecclesiæ denuntiationem ritè ab unitate ecclesiæ præcisus est et excommunicatus, is ab uniuersa fidelium multitudine, donec per pœnitentiam publicè reconciliatus fuerit, arbitrio Iudicis competentis, habendus est tanquam Ethnicus et Publicanus.

1571.

Of excommunicate persons, howe they are to be auoided.

That person whiche by open denuntiation of the Churche, is ryghtly cut of from the vnitie of the Churche, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faythfull as an Heathen and Publicane, vntill he be openly reconciled by penaunce, and receaued into the Churche by a iudge that hath aucthoritie thereto.

i. **Source and Language.** The Thirty-third Article is based on the Fifth Article of the Augsburg Confession, and in language has undergone no change since the first draft in 1553.

ii. **The Object.** Its object is to settle questions which arose in the xvith century respecting internal discipline, a topic which excited the most vehement disputation in the reign of Edward VI[1]. For several sects of disordered spiritualists, setting at naught the letter of Holy Scripture, professed to have reached such a stage of perfection, that they were beyond all need of discipline.

iii. **Analysis.** The question as to the right of the Church to exercise discipline is not raised in the Article. It is assumed, and the only point discussed is the way in which it is to be carried out. It affirms that:—

[1] See Hardwick, *Hist. Articles*, pp. 91, 104.

(i) He who by open denunciation...is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church and excommunicated, "ought to be regarded by the whole body of the faithful as a heathen man and a publican; and that

(ii) He is to be so regarded, until he be openly reconciled by penance and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto."

iv. **Jewish Excommunication.** Under the Jewish Law there were three kinds of excommunication:

(*a*) One of the simplest description, involving exclusion from the congregation for a period of a month, or, in the event of impenitence, two or three months[1].

(*b*) A second, or more severe kind, accompanied with imprecations from Deut. xxviii. and other places of Scripture[2]:

(*c*) The third and heaviest form, involving total expulsion from the Synagogue, and handing over to the power of the Evil One[3].

v. **In the New Testament** we find our Lord laying down three courses to be observed in the case of offences. He enjoins that if a brother sin against another, (i) The party, who deems himself offended, is to tell the other privately of the matter which has caused offence; (ii) If this fails, there is to be reprehension before two or three witnesses; (iii) In the event of continued refusal to be

[1] נִדּוּי *Niddui.* See Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.*

[2] חֵרֶם *Cherem.* With one under this sentence none might consort, *no, not to eat.* To this S. Paul is supposed to allude in 1 Cor. v. 11.

[3] שַׁמְּתָא *Shammata*; comp. John ix. 34, καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω; xii. 42, διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὡμολόγουν, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται.

reconciled, then the offended party is to tell the matter to the Church, and, if there be still no signs of penitence, the offender is to be no longer regarded as a Christian, but *as a heathen man and a publican* (Matt. xviii. 15—17).

vi. **Apostolic Practice.** In accordance with these regulations we find S. Paul in the case of the incestuous person at Corinth enjoining the members of the Church there to *assemble together in the Name of the Lord Jesus* (1 Cor. v. 4), and while he himself is with them in spirit, to deliver over the offender *to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus* (1 Cor. v. 4, 5). And when the incestuous man repents, the same Apostle enjoins the Corinthians to restore and forgive him, and promises that whosoever they forgive he will forgive also (2 Cor. ii. 5—11). Again, he threatens to enquire judicially into the case of certain persons in the same Church, and to *deal sharply with them according to the power which the Lord had given him* (2 Cor. xiii. 10). Thus also he informs Timothy that he had himself excommunicated Hymenæus and Alexander (1 Tim. i. 20), and he gives directions to him and to Titus how they are to judge, rebuke, and reject wherever necessary (1 Tim. v. 19—21; Tit. iii. 10, 11).

vii. **Christian Excommunication.** That the example of S. Paul should be followed in the early Church was only natural, and we find that, as amongst the Jews, the exercise of discipline was carried out on a graduated scale: (*a*) The more lenient form consisted of separation from the Holy Eucharist and from the prayers of the faithful, but it did not exclude the offender wholly from the Church; (*b*) an intermediate form excluded the offender for a longer period than the first; (*c*) the great Excommunication, called "Anathema," involved a total

exclusion from all Church communion and from all Christian privileges[1]. The Judge or Officer, who was empowered by the early Church to impose and remove[2] the penalties of Excommunication was the Bishop. But during the Middle Ages this power was claimed almost exclusively for the Popes, and in their hands acquired a new and terrible meaning. Of this we have prominent examples in the Excommunication of the Emperor Henry IV. by Pope Gregory VII., and the Interdict, under which all England was laid in the reign of John by Pope Innocent III.

viii. **The Reformers** generally recognised the power of Excommunication, as is proved by the statement contained in the Augsburg and Saxon Confessions. Calvin was a very strict asserter of this authority on the part of the Church, and divided it into (1) private monition, (2) reprehension before witnesses, (3) exclusion from the Holy Communion, humiliation before God, and open confession before the Church[3]. In our own Church we have in the Commination Service the recitation of the doom of wilful sinners as contained in Deut. xxviii. 11—26[4], and the Rubric before the Holy Communion directs the Priest to repel notorious and evil livers from participation in that Holy Feast, provided that he at once acquaints the Bishop of the fact of his so doing. The Excommunication contemplated in the Article is that known as "the greater Excommunication." It can never be inflicted except by a Judge in a properly constituted Ecclesiastical court, and

[1] See Bingham, *Eccl. Antiq.*, Bk. xvi., Ch. ii. 7, 8; and Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities.*

[2] For the form observed at such a solemn anathema, see the office in the Sarum Pontifical, Maskell, *Mon. Rit. Eccl. Angl.* II. clxv.

[3] Calvin, *Instit.* iv. xii. 2. This Reformer exempted no one, not even the sovereign, from such censures, and he quotes the case of Theodosius excommunicated by S. Ambrose as a precedent for rigour in all cases.

[4] For the recitation of these dooms in the time of Joshua see Josh. viii. 33—35.

this is implied by the words "rightly cut off," that is in a formal and regular manner, and even now the power of these courts to excommunicate, and even to order penance for living in incest, adultery, or fornication has not been entirely taken away[1].

[1] The extent to which it still remains is substantially defined by the Act 53 George III. c. 127. See Hook's *Church Dictionary*, p. 339, new edition, 1887, and Phillimore's *Eccles. Law*, p. 1375.

ARTICLE XXXIV.

1563.

Traditiones Ecclesiasticæ.

Traditiones atque cæremonias eas-dem, non omnino necessarium est esse ubique aut prorsus consimiles. Nam et uariæ semper fuerunt, et mutari possunt, pro regionum, temporum, et morum diuersitate, modo nihil contra uerbum Dei instituatur.

Traditiones et cæremonias ecclesiasticas quæ cum uerbo Dei non pugnant, et sunt autoritate publica institutæ atque probatæ, quisquis priuato consilio uolens et data operâ publicè uiolauerit, is, ut qui peccat in publicum ordinem ecclesiæ, quique lædit autoritatem Magistratus, et qui infirmorum fratrum conscientias uulnerat, publicè, ut cæteri timeant, arguendus est.

Quælibet ecclesia particularis, siue nationalis, autoritatem habet instituendi, mutandi, aut abrogandi cæremonias aut ritus Ecclesiasticos, humana tantum autoritate institutos, modò omnia ad ædificationem fiant.

1571.

Of the traditions of the Churche.

It is not necessarie that traditions and ceremonies be in al places one, or vtterly like, for at all times they haue ben diuerse, and may be chaunged accordyng to the diuersitie of countreys, times, and mens maners, so that nothing be ordeyned against Gods worde. Whosoeuer through his priuate iudgement, wyllyngly and purposely doth openly breake the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnaunt to the worde of God, and be ordayned and approued by common aucthoritie, ought to be rebuked openly, (that other may feare to do the lyke) as he that offendeth agaynst the Common order of the Churche, and hurteth the aucthoritie of the Magistrate, and woundeth the consciences of the weak brethren.

Euery particuler or nationall Churche, hath aucthoritie to ordaine, chaunge, and abolishe ceremonies or rites of the Churche ordeyned onlye by mans aucthoritie, so that all thinges be done to edifiyng.

i. **Origin.** The Thirty-fourth Article is derived from the Fifth of the Thirteen Articles of 1538[1], which contains many of the expressions incorporated in the former.

[1] "*Traditiones* vero et ritus *atque cæremoniæ*, quæ vel ad *decorem* vel *ordinem* vel disciplinam Ecclesiæ ab hominibus sunt institutæ, *non omnino necesse est* ut *eædem* sint *ubique aut prorsus similes*. Hæ enim *et variæ fuere*, et variari *possint pro regionum et morum diversitate*, ubi decus, ordo, et utilitas Ecclesiæ videbuntur postulare." Art. v *de* Ecclesia. The follow-

ii. **Language.** As originally drafted in 1553 it consisted of only two clauses, the present first and second. The third clause was not added till 1563, after the Council of Trent had so far sought to annihilate the distinction of National Churches, as to introduce a uniformity, not only of doctrine, but also of ceremonial and of discipline throughout the West[1].

iii. **Object.** While, then, it asserts in opposition to the teaching of the Anabaptists that (1) Church traditions[2], ceremonies, rites and customs ought not to be violated at the impulse of man's private judgment, and that (2) private persons are not justified of their own will in breaking the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, so long as they are not repugnant to God's Word[3], it stoutly affirms that

ing paragraph is written on a loose slip of paper, as if subsequently added: 'Hæ enim et *variæ fuere*, et variari *possunt pro regionum et morum diversitate*, ubi decus decensque ordo principibus rectoribusque regionum videbuntur postulare; ita tamen ut *nihil* varietur aut *instituatur contra verbum Dei* manifestum.' Hardwick, *Hist. of Articles*, *Appendix* II. p. 264.

[1] The question of "the indeterminate and ever-widening authority which the Popes asserted over the kingdoms and Churches of the West" had been submitted to the judgment of Western Christendom so early as the Council of Pisa in 1409. The national and conciliar or anti-Papal view had been boldly urged by such great Gallicans as Gerson and Peter d'Ailly, and it is interesting to note the strength of their position in the fact that at the Council of Constance in 1414 the votes of those present were given by nations and not individually; but at the Council of Basel in 1437 the position was reversed, "its method of procedure ran counter to the new direction which had been communicated to European federacy by the action of the Constance congress," and thus the way was paved for the final triumph of Pontifical Absolutism at the conclusion of the Council of Trent in 1563. Compare Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, *The Catholic Reaction*, Pt. I. pp. 98 sqq.

[2] "The word 'tradition' in the sense in which the Article means it to be taken, is synonymous with the term 'consuetudo,' meaning such a custom as is produced by the simultaneous and frequent action of the greater part of a community." Bp. Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 670. Compare the answer of Gregory the Great to the second Interrogation of S. Augustine, "Ex singulis ergo quibusque Ecclesiis, quæ pia, quæ religiosa, quæ recta sunt elige, et hæc quasi in fasciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes *in consuetudinem* depone." Bede *Hist. Eccl.* ii. 27.

[3] "That paramount authority of Holy Scripture, which is so remarkable a characteristic of the Thirty-nine Articles, and which the Church of England inherited from the great teachers of the Middle Ages, supplies the limit to the diversity of the traditions of the

(3) every particular or National Church has authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, provided only that all things be done to edifying.

iv. **The Teaching of Scripture** does not supply us with much reliable information for or against the first of these three statements. S. Paul lays it down as a general rule that *all things should be done unto edifying* (1 Cor. xiv. 26), and that in church *everything should be done decently and in order* (1 Cor. xiv. 40). These directions of the Apostle leave much liberty in the ordaining of the ceremonies and services of the Church.

v. **The Teaching of Church History** makes it plain that the different Churches, though wonderfully concordant in doctrine and Apostolical government, yet exhibited great variety in discipline and ritual. Thus

(α) The Eastern and Western Churches differed as regards the time of keeping Easter. The Western Churches keeping it as we keep it now, so that it always falls on a Sunday, while the Churches of Asia commemorated the Crucifixion on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, after the manner of the Jewish Passover, on whatever day of the week it might fall, and the Resurrection on the sixteenth[1].

(β) The Church of Rome differed from the Church of Africa on the important question of the

Church." Bp. Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 672. The limitations to the influence of such consuetudo is suggested by Cyprian's attitude towards Pope Stephen in respect of the re-baptism of heretics: "Proinde frustra quidem qui ratione vincuntur *consuetudinem* nobis opponunt; quasi *consuetudo major sit veritate*, aut id sit in spiritualibus sequendum quod in melius fuerit a Sancto Spiritu revelatum." Cypr. *de Hæret. Baptiz.*, *Ep.* lxxiii.

[1] See the *Chronicon Paschale*, i. pp. 12—14, ed. Dindorf; Kentz, *Handbuch*, i. 243 ff. For the visit of S. Polycarp of Smyrna to Anicetus, Bishop of Rome, on the subject see Eusebius *H. E.* iv. 14. v. 24, § 16.

re-baptism of heretics. While Cyprian and the African Bishops maintained that those who had been baptized by heretics ought to be re-baptized[1], Pope Stephen and the Roman Church maintained that such Baptism was valid, and therefore could not be repeated[2].

(γ) Again, Churches differed as to the mode in which the Jewish Sabbath ought to be treated, some observing the Lord's Day only, others the Saturday and Jewish Sabbath also; some were wont to fast on Friday[3], the day of our Lord's Crucifixion, others on Friday and Saturday also, as the day on which the Lord lay in the grave[4].

(δ) Once more, each Bishop was allowed to frame his own Liturgy, and hence we have the Liturgies of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Rome, Gaul, and Spain, in which while certain characteristics remain constant,

[1] "The same view was held in Asia Minor, Alexandria, and many other Eastern Churches, and was sanctioned by a series of provincial Synods at Carthage, Iconium, and Synnada." Cheetham's *First Six Centuries*, p. 153.

[2] For Stephen's keen opposition to Cyprian on the point see Fermilian's letter to Cyprian, Cyp. *Epist.* 75, c. 28. The contest was an obstinate one and outlived both the principal combatants. Gradually the Roman practice prevailed, and was sanctioned at the Synod of Arles in the year 314. Hardouin's *Conc.*, i. 265.

[3] Especially those of the Patriarchate of Antioch. There was a marked difference in manner between those who did observe the Saturday. In the East it was customary to observe it as a Festival, in the West as a Fast. "Alii, sicut maxime populi Orientis, propter requiem significandam mallent relaxare jejunium, alii propter humilitatem mortis Domini jejunare, sicut Romana et nonnullæ Occidentis Ecclesiæ." S. Aug. *ad Casulam*, Ep. xxxvi.; cf. Bingham *Antiqq.* xx. (3) 5, 6. Hence we have the statement of S. Augustine respecting the custom of S. Ambrose: "Cum Romam venio, jejuno Sabbato; cum hic sum, non jejuno. Sic enim tu, ad quam forte Ecclesiam veneris, ejus morem serva, si cuiquam non vis esse scandalo, nec quemquam tibi." S. Aug. *Ad Inquisitiones Januar.* i. Ep. liv.

[4] On the variety of customs in different Churches see Sozomen, *Eccl. Hist.* vii. c. 19.

there are many differences of detail and of arrangement[1].

Thus the action of the Holy Ghost within the Church of Christ illumines the minds of the different nations without destroying their national characteristics, and therefore we cannot be surprised to find many marked peculiarities in the services and ceremonies of the different Churches throughout the world. Forms of devotion and edifying rites will be ever profoundly modified by climate, by the history of thought, and by the degree of civilisation that may have been attained[2]. Absolute uniformity of ritual and worship is not desirable. It may be gained, but it will be at the expense of customs, to which tradition imparts a peculiar value, and of that sense of largeness and freedom, which is so important an element, and so conducive to the health and proper action of the Body of Christ[3].

vi. **The Second Clause** of the Article contains a caution against those persons, who, of their private judgment, wantonly break or neglect the traditions of the Church. For by such infringement (i) they "offend against the common order of the Church;" (ii) they "hurt the authority of the magistrate[4];" (iii) they "wound the consciences of the weak[5] brethren."

[1] See Archdeacon Cheetham's *First Six Centuries*, p. 380.

[2] Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 672.

[3] For the moral bearing of the question comp. S. Aug. *ad Casulam*, Ep. xxxvi. "In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit Scriptura divina, mos populi Dei, vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt. De quibus si disputare voluerimus, et ex aliorum consuetudine alios improbare, orietur interminata luctatio, quælabore sermocinationis, quum certa documenta nulla veritatis insinuet, utique cavendum est ne tempestate contentionis serenitatem caritatis obnubilet."

[4] The authority of the Church in these matters is placed first; and then the injury done to the authority of the magistrate. "For since, according to ancient custom, the magistrate gave a civil sanction to customs or 'the common order of the Church,' then, to infringe that, to which he had lent this sanction, was to lower his authority also. The wont of giving such civil sanction to the laws of the Church dates back to the earliest times of the converted Empire." See Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, pp. 676—679.

[5] "In Rom. xiv. 1 sqq., the ἀσθενὴς

vii. **The authority of Scripture** is strong against those who do this. Thus

(α) Our Lord enjoined His disciples to obey the Pharisees, because they *sat in Moses' seat*[1] (Matt. xxiii. 2).

(β) The Apostles in all things not unlawful adhered to Jewish observances and followed the customs of their own nation even after the Church of Christ had been established[2] (Acts ii. 46; xxi. 20, 26), and S. Paul specially exhorts his Thessalonian converts *to withdraw themselves from every brother that walked disorderly*[3] (2 Thess. iii. 6), and while he bids the Christians of Rome *mark those who caused the divisions and occasions of stumbling contrary to the doctrine which they learned* (Rom. xvi. 17), he enjoins all to obey their spiritual rulers, and to submit themselves to them[4].

viii. **National Churches.** The Article concludes with a vigorous assertion of the independence of National Churches. Obviously this independence in no way affects

contemplated by S. Paul is the man who has his own private rule, probably of Essenic origin, relative to the use of meats and the observance of days; he is free to frame and use such a rule, but not free to regard it as of universal obligation; the *δυνατός* on the other hand, who binds himself by no such rule, is not free to treat the *ἀσθενής* with contempt." Comp. Liddon, *in loc.*

[1] *Ἐπὶ τῆς Μωυσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἂν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν ποιήσατε καὶ τηρεῖτε.* Observe the tenses; *ποιήσατε* = "do the special act enjoined"; *τηρεῖτε* = "continue to observe."

[2] "God had not yet abolished the synagogue; the Sanhedrin still asserted a rightful jurisdiction over the Jewish Church, and the believers submitted to it on all points but one, where they must obey God rather than man." Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, pp. 72, 73.

[3] *Στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος.* 2 Thess. iii. 6. The literal meaning is *to take in your sails* (*στέλλεσθαι τὰ ἱστία*) so as to steer clear of a rock or reef. Here *to part company with, decline from*, and *avoid* a brother who walked disorderly.

[4] Comp. 1 Cor. xvi. 16; 1 Thess. v. 12; Heb. xiii. 17.

the Faith. The Faith is one everywhere, and at all times. What the Article claims is only that "every particular or National Church[1] hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites ordained only by man's authority." Even under the Empire National Churches, like those of Africa, Spain, and Gaul, used each their own code, and were marked by variations of practice in things non-essential[2]. And if this was so, much more is variation permissible in reference to inferior matters, such as discipline, ceremonies, and whatsoever tends to the edification of each local Church. This principle was fully admitted by Gregory the Great[3], when he bade S. Augustine of Canterbury carefully select whatever he found in the Church of Rome, or Gaul, or in any Church whatever that was likely to please Almighty God, and introduce it into the Church of England, then new in the Faith, remembering that we must love not things for places, but places for things[4]. This direction of the great Bishop is in harmony with the position taken up in the present Article.

[1] See Bp Forbes, *On the Articles*, p. 684.

[2] Compare the Sixth Canon of the Council of Nicæa in reference to such a national independence in things non-essential, *τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὰ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.*

[3] See Bede *Eccl. Hist.* i. 27. "Mihi placet, sive in Romana, sive in Galliarum, seu in qualibet ecclesia, aliquid invenisti quod plus omnipotenti Deo possit placere, sollicite eligas, et in Anglorum Ecclesia, quæ adhuc ad fidem nova est, institutione præcipua, quæ de multis Ecclesiis colligere potuisti, infundas. Non enim pro locis res, sed pro bonis rebus loca amanda sunt."

[4] At the Council of Florence, a Canon was made in the exact sense of this very Article, that everyone should observe the rites and customs of his own Church, which it is not lawful for anyone to change by his private authority. For the national character of our branch of the Church Catholic as "founded in the estate of prelacy within the realm of England," see Earl Selborne's *Defence*, pp. 9, 10; Aubrey Moore's *History of the Reformation*, pp. 35, 40.

GROUP V.

ARTICLES XXXV.—XXXIX.

The Articles in this group deal with certain points affecting the Church and the Realm of England.

(α) They treat of the two Books of Homilies put forth in the Sixteenth Century (Art. XXXV.), and defend the Anglican Ordinal as containing all things really necessary to valid Ordination (Art. XXXVI.);

(β) They define the limits of the Royal Supremacy, and assert its right to be free from all foreign jurisdiction (Art. XXXVII.);

(γ) Lastly they touch on certain points put forward by the Anabaptists respecting capital punishment and the lawfulness of war (Art. XXXVII.), community of goods (Art. XXXVIII.), and the right of a Christian man to take an oath in a Court of Justice (Art. XXXIX.).

ARTICLE XXXV.

1563.

De Homiliis.

[Tomus secundus Homiliarum, quarum singulos titulos huic Articulo subiunximus, continet piam et salutarem doctrinam, et hijs temporibus necessariam, non minus quàm prior Tomus Homiliarum quæ editæ sunt tempore Edwardi sexti. Itaque eas in ecclesijs per ministros diligenter et clarè, ut à populo intelligi possint, recitandas esse iudicamus.]

Catalogus Homiliarum.

De recto ecclesiæ usu.
Aduersus Idololatriæ pericula.
De reparandis ac purgandis ecclesijs.
De bonis operibus.
De ieiunio.
In gulæ atque ebrietatis uitia.
In nimis sumptuosos uestium apparatus.
De oratione siue precatione.
De loco et tempore orationi destinatis.
De publicis precibus ac Sacramentis, idiomate uulgari omnibusque noto, habendis.
De sacrosancta uerbi divini autoritate.
De eleemosina.
De Christi natiuitate.
De dominica passione.
De resurrectione Domini.
De digna corporis et sanguinis dominici in cœna Domini participatione.
De donis spiritus sancti.
In diebus, qui uulgo Rogationum dicti sunt, concio.
De matrimonij statu.
De otio seu socordia.
De pœnitentia.

1571.

Of Homilies.

The seconde booke of Homilies, the seuerall titles whereof we haue ioyned vnder this article, doth conteyne a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessarie for these tymes, as doth the former booke of Homilies, whiche were set foorth in the time of Edwarde the sixt: and therefore we iudge them to be read in Churches by the Ministers diligently, and distinctly, that they may be vnderstanded of the people.

Of the names of the Homilies.

1 Of the right vse of the Churche.
2 Agaynst perill of Idolatrie.
3 Of repayring and keping cleane of Churches.
4 Of good workes, first of fastyng.
5 Agaynst gluttony and drunkennesse.
6 Against excesse of apparell.
7 Of prayer.
8 Of the place and time of prayer.
9 That common prayers and Sacramentes ought to be ministred in a knowen tongue.
10 Of the reuerente estimation of Gods worde.
11 Of almes doing.
12 Of the Natiuitie of Christe.
13 Of the passion of Christe.
14 Of the resurrection of Christe.
15 Of the worthie receauing of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christe.
16 Of the gyftes of the holy ghost.
17 For the Rogation dayes.
18 Of the state of Matrimonie.
19 Of repentaunce.
20 Agaynst Idlenesse.
21 Agaynst rebellion.

i. **The Title** of this Article was originally *Homiliæ*, "Homilies," and in 1571, *De Homiliis*, "Of Homilies." In 1563 the statement about the Homilies, without the Title, was appended to the preceding Article on Ecclesiastical Traditions. The *Catalogus Homiliarum*, so entitled, constituted the next Article, Art. XXXIV. of that year. In 1571 the Title *De Homiliis* and the text subjoined were introduced as an independent Article by Archbishop Parker.

ii. **The Word Homily**[1] denotes (1) a familiar or colloquial discourse[2], (2) an inartificial, popular address delivered to a congregation[3]. From the beginning of the Church's activity the preaching of Sermons and Homilies formed a very important department of its teaching office, and mainly took the form of comments on the Divine Scriptures, and expositions of large consecutive passages. These expositions and "teachings[4]" lived on during the

[1] The substantive Ὁμιλία occurs in 1 Cor. xv. 33, *φθείρουσιν ἤθη χρήσθ' ὁμιλίαι κακαί*. Here the word is used in the sense of "evil company," "Evil company doth corrupt good manners." The verb from which it is formed occurs more frequently in the New Testament. Thus in S. Luke xxiv. 14 we are told of the two journeying to Emmaus that *they communed* (ὡμίλουν) *with each other of all those things which had happened;* and in Acts xx. 11 we find S. Paul at Troas *talking* to those assembled (ὁμιλήσας) *a long while, even till break of day;* and it is said on another occasion that Felix *communed with Paul* (ὡμίλει) Acts xxiv. 25.

[2] In Xenophon *Mem.* I. ii. 6 and 15 the word ὁμιλία is used for the instruction which a philosopher gave his pupils in familiar conversation.

[3] The word did not pass into common use in this sense in Latin before the fifth century. Victor Vitensis towards the end of that century speaks of Augustine's popular addresses, "quos Græci *homilias* vocant," as if 'homilia' were still somewhat strange to his Latin readers. Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* i. 781.

[4] The most primitive types of Homilies are perhaps the discourses which accompanied the celebration of the Holy Eucharist (Acts xx. 7 *sqq*). To these Justin Martyr refers as follows: *εἶτα παυσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται*, Apol. i. 67. Another instance is the instruction, which was delivered to the Catechumens at the Traditio Symboli, and of this S. Augustine's *Sermo ad Catechumenos* is a specimen. This instruction in subsequent times assumed a fixed form, and was termed in the Latin Church *Præfatio Symboli*. Exhortations from the Holy Scriptures form a great part of the writings of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Chrysostom, S. Gregory of Nyssa, S. Gregory Nazianzen, and S. Basil in the East, of S. Ambrose, S. Augustine,

Middle Ages[1], and the habit of preaching varied with the fervour or languor of the Church. In the East it gradually died out, and at present hardly forms any part of the public worship of the Church. In the West it never entirely ceased even in the worst of times. Preaching at the time of the Reformation had greatly deteriorated. The practice had almost been abandoned by the parochial Clergy and left to the Friars. The Reformers, before the actual breach with Rome, had already begun to use this weapon for their own purposes, and when the breach had taken place, they saw plainly its great importance[2].

iii. **The First Book of Homilies** was the first book pertaining to the teaching of the Church of England which was put forth in the reign of Edward VI. Of the Twelve Homilies which it contained three at least, including that *Of the Salvation of all Mankind, Of the true and lively Faith*, and the *Exhortation to the reading and knowledge of the Holy Scripture*, appear to have been written by Cranmer himself, while those *Of the Misery of all Mankind* and *Of Christian Love and Charity* were the work of Bishop Bonner and his Chaplain[3]. Nine editions of this book were printed before the end of 1547, but they were

and S. Leo in the West. Bede's *Homiliæ de Tempore* were much used by those who were unable or unwilling to compose sermons. Charles the Great commissioned Paul Warnefrid to draw up a collection of Homilies from the Fathers. In A.D. 813 the Council of Rheims enjoined the Bishops to preach Sermons of the Fathers in the dialect of their several dioceses. The Collection of Ælfric was probably the successor of various other collections of English Homilies, some of which may have existed before the time of Charles the Great. See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiqq.* ii. p. 782.

[1] During the Middle Ages the Sermons of S. Bernard, of eminent preachers belonging to the Dominican Order, of Savonarola, of S. Anthony of Padua exerted a great effect. For the names of authors of mediæval Sermons which were deemed most worthy of preservation after the invention of printing, see Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 692.

[2] *Postils on the Epistles and Gospels* were, with Cranmer's sanction, edited and in part composed by Richard Taverner, Clerk of the Signet to Henry VIIIth, as early as 1540.

[3] Hardwick's *History of the Reformation*, p. 211, n. 5.

received with scant favour. If the Priest misliked both them and the "Men of the New Learning," from whom they emanated, he read them unintelligibly. If the people objected to them, there was such talking and babbling in church, that not a word could be heard[1].

iv. **The Second Book of Homilies.** It was intended during the reign of Edward VIth to put out a fresh Book of Homilies, but this was prevented by his death and the accession of Queen Mary[2]. When Elizabeth came to the throne, a second Book of Homilies was drawn up, and together with the Thirty-Nine Articles was submitted to Convocation in 1562. The queen took some time to consider them and they were not in the hands of the public till Aug. 1, 1563. These new Homilies, twenty in number, were, it is supposed, to a great extent the work of Bishop Jewel. But their authorship has not in every case been ascertained, and a considerable portion of the material, out of which the book was framed, is traceable to foreign sources[3].

v. **Their Reception.** At first, as we have seen, it was necessary to enjoin the Clergy to read the Homilies distinctly, on account of the general dislike of the innovations they contained. In the course of time, however, the tone of feeling changed, and the Puritans were the chief

[1] Hence the necessity for the words of the Article, "eas in Ecclesiis per ministros diligenter et clarè, ut à populo intelligi possint recitandas esse judicavimus."

[2] Bonner, however, published some Homilies in Mary's reign.

[3] Hardwick's *History of the Reformation*, p. 249, *n.* 4. Of Homily x., on "Certain Passages in Scripture," a few sentences were taken from a tract of Erasmus; Homily xi. "Of Almsdeeds" is greatly drawn from S. Cyprian; Hom. xviii. "Of Matrimony, is derived half from Veit Dietricke of Nuremberg, and half from S. Chrysostom; Hom. xix. "Of Repentance," is translated to a great extent from Rudolph Gualther. The xxist "Against Rebellion" was added on the occasion of the rising in the North of England instigated with a view of restoring the Roman obedience by the Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland.

party who disliked them[1], on the ground that nothing uninspired ought to be read in church. The Homilies were now enjoined to be read by way of stifling "the prophesyings[2]," and for this reason were appealed to by James I., who directed their use[3]. There is little danger in these days of the Homilies being esteemed by the people as of like authority with Holy Scripture, and the objection to them on this ground would equally apply to the use of Sermons and Hymns as part of public worship.

vi. **Their Authority.** The measure of the authority of the Homilies has been diversely estimated. While some would hardly attach to them any real value, others would elevate them almost to the position of a standard of doctrine. Their value is sufficiently expressed in the words of the Article itself, when it says that they "contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," and necessary for the times in which they were drawn up. We are not required to express approval of every statement which occurs in them. The assent we are called upon to give to them is general,

[1] Hardwick *On the Articles*, p. 205; *History of the Reformation*, p. 232. Many of the exiles during the reign of Mary, unaccustomed for some years to such services as those of the English Church, no sooner returned than they lost no time in expressing their dislike of them. "Remove Homylies, Articles, Injunctions" was soon the cry.

[2] The "Method of Prophesying," especially rife in East Anglia, under the patronage of Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, was rigorously suppressed by Archbishop Parker in 1574. About two years later Archbishop Grindal though opposed by the queen, who held that the remedy would be found in great measure in the use of the Homilies, attempted to regulate "the Prophesyings." Strype's *Grindal*, p. 325 *sqq.*, 341 *sqq.*; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* i. pp. 389 *sqq.*

[3] See his directions concerning "preachers," dated Aug. 4, 1622. They were due in part to the action of Knight, an Oxford Preacher, who had defended the right of the subject to arm against the sovereign. The king immediately "tuned the pulpits" by requiring Archbishop Abbott to issue, through his suffragans, six "Directions," to the Preachers, which limited the subjects to be treated of to such as were warranted by the formularies of the Church, and forbade the discussion of such matters as predestination, and the royal prerogative, and all this under penalty of suspension. Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* i. pp. 723 *sqq.*; Cardwell, *Doc. Ann.* ii. 198 *sqq.*

not specific. They were well adapted for the age which called them forth, and are of no little value as reflecting the views of those, who reformed our services and drew up our Articles, and as throwing light on documents more authoritative than themselves[1].

[1] Bp Browne, *On the Articles*, p. 777.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

1563.

De Episcoporum et Ministrorum consecratione.

Libellus de Consecratione Archiepiscoporum & Episcoporum & de ordinatione Presbyterorum & Diaconorum æditus nuper temporibus Edwardi sexti, & autoritate Parlamenti illis ipsis temporibus confirmatus, omnia ad eiusmodi consecrationem & ordinationem necessaria continet, & nihil habet quod ex se sit aut superstitiosum aut impium. Itaque quicunque iuxta ritus illius libri consecrati aut ordinati sunt ab Anno secundo prædicti Regis Edwardi, usque ad hoc tempus, aut in posterum iuxta eosdem ritus consecrabuntur aut ordinabuntur ritè, ordine, atque legitimè, statuimus esse & fore consecratos & ordinatos.

1571.

Of consecration of Bishops and ministers.

The booke of Consecration of Archbyshops, and Byshops, and ordering of Priestes and Deacons, lately set foorth in the time of Edwarde the sixt, and confyrmed at the same tyme by aucthoritie of Parliament, doth conteyne all things necessarie to suche consecration and orderyng: neyther hath it any thing, that of it selfe is superstitious or vngodly. And therefore, whosoeuer are consecrate or ordered accordyng to the rites of that booke, since the seconde yere of the aforenamed king Edwarde, vnto this time, or hereafter shalbe consecrated or ordered accordyng to the same rites, we decree all such to be ryghtly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

i. **The present Title** of the XXXVIth Article varies considerably from that in the original draft. In 1553 it ran, "Of the booke of Praiers, and Ceremonies of the Churche of Englande[1]." Thus it covered the whole Prayer-Book. But in 1563 the part of the Article relating to the Prayer-Book itself was omitted[2], and it was restricted to the Ordinal or the "Consecration of Bishops and Ministers."

ii. **The Ordinal.** On Jan. 31, 1550, six prelates and six other men of the realm, "learned in God's law," were

[1] Or as it ran in Latin, "De Libro Præcationum et cæremoniarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ."

[2] It was incorporated with the Preface to the Prayer-Book.

appointed to prepare an Ordinal as a companion to the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.[1], and this with a few changes was added to the revised Prayer-Book of 1552. The Ordinal, thus drawn up, was again revised by Convocation in 1661[2], and has ever since been retained in the Church of England.

iii. **Object.** It was to confirm the authority of this Ordinal that the present Article was inserted by the Convocation of 1562 in place of the old XXXVth Article, which covered the whole Prayer-Book. The intention of those who drew it up was to confute the views of two opposite parties:—(α) the Mediævalists, who objected to the Ordinal on the ground that it lacked some, as they supposed, essential ceremonies; (β) the extreme Reformers, who took grave exception to it as containing some superstitious forms and phrases.

iv. **Analysis.** As against the first class of objectors the Article asserts that

(α) The Ordinal set forth in the reign of Edward VI. contains all things necessary to both "Consecration and Ordering";

(β) As against the second it affirms that it contains nothing "that of itself is superstitious and ungodly";

(γ) It concludes by stating clearly and explicitly that "all such are rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered," who either have been or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of this Book[3].

[1] See Procter on *The Book of Common Prayer*, p. 31.

[2] Lathbury, *History of Convocation*, p. 288.

[3] The Puritans were ever clamouring against "that prescripte Order of seruice made out of the Masse-booke." They maintained that in addition to

v. **The First Objection** to the validity of our Orders on the part of Roman divines is founded on an alleged flaw in their derivation. They are derived through Matthew Parker[1], who was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury on Sunday, December 17, 1559. He was consecrated according to the Ordinal of the Church of England in the chapel of Lambeth Palace by William Barlow, who was Bishop of Bath and Wells before Mary's accession, and was then Bishop-elect of Chichester; by John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, then Bishop-elect of Hereford; by Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter[2]; and by John Hodgkyns[3], Bishop suffragan of Bedford. A story, invented some fifty years later, endeavoured to throw discredit on Parker's consecration by representing that it took place in a tavern in a ludicrous manner[4]. But no historical fact is more certain than the due and orderly performance of the

its ritual deformities, the Prayer-Book was "full of corruptions," that in the Ordinal there was one paragraph, which they never hesitated to condemn as "manifest blasphemy," and some, for this reason, steadily refused to sign the Articles in 1571, when called into the presence of the High Commissioners." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 206.

[1] He had been chaplain to Elizabeth's mother and her father, and in king Edward's time, Dean of Lincoln. The queen had an especial affection for him, and he was held in high esteem by her leading ministers.

[2] Scory and Coverdale were consecrated at Croydon on Aug. 30, 1551, by Cranmer of Canterbury, Ridley of London, and Hodgkyns, Bishop suffragan of Bedford.

[3] Hodgkyns was consecrated on Dec. 9, 1537, according to the Sarum Pontifical by Stokesley, Bishop of London, Hilsey, Bishop of Rochester, and Wharton, Bishop of S. Asaph.

[4] "The 'Nag's Head' fable was not alleged till the beginning of the seventeenth century, and even Canon Estcourt allows that it is very unfortunate it was ever seriously put forward; for it is so absurd on the face of it that it has led to the suspicion of Catholic theologians not being sincere in the objections they make to Anglican orders." Estcourt, *Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed*, p. 154. "When the fiction was put forward the aged Earl of Nottingham, who (then being 23 years of age) had been, as a connection of Parker's, present at the actual consecration in Lambeth Chapel, when the story was told at the Privy Council, declared it to be false, and referred in confirmation of this statement to the account which had been drawn up at the time and given by the Archbishop to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The king thereupon sent for it, and it was found to corroborate the earl's statement. The chaplain to the earl's son also declared that his father had often heard from the old earl the same account of the consecration." See Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, vol. v. p. 553.

ceremony in the chapel of Lambeth Palace. Then it is objected that the evidence is insufficient to show that Bishop Barlow, who acted as the head of the Commission for consecrating Parker, was himself consecrated. This, however, would not amount to an insuperable defect, even if it were true, for *all* the Bishops *laid their hands* on Parker, and *all repeated the words*[1], and thus each performed the complete act of consecration. But, in point of fact, there is no valid ground for doubting the fact of Barlow's consecration. It is true that the record of it is absent from the Lambeth register. But this register was carelessly kept, and is acknowledged to be incomplete[2]. It lacks the record of the consecration of Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Stokesley, Bishop of London, who were consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII., and of some six or seven prelates, who are known to have been consecrated during Cranmer's primacy. The omission, therefore, of Barlow's name in the record may be regretted, but it is no real defect as regards his consecration, and when it is considered that Parker was elected by the Chapter of Canterbury, and confirmed without opposition at Bow Church[3]; that he was consecrated by four bishops, all of whom laid their hands upon him; that no official or formal protest was made at the time against his consecration; that no rival claimant to the See was put forward[4]; and that for

[1] In this exceptional precaution they probably followed the precedent of the Exeter Pontifical; Cp Bishop Lacy's *Lib. Pontif.;* Maskell's *Mon. Ritual.* vol. iii. p. 258.

[2] Thus in Pole's Register there are two omissions, Goldwell, S. Asaph, 1554, and Pate, Worcester, 1555, while in that kept by Archbishop Warham, there are seven lacunæ. Thus, whereas during his archiepiscopate there were 26 bishops consecrated, the records of 20 of these consecrations only are given, while 6 are missing, viz. Blyth of Lichfield and Coventry, 1503; Penry of Bangor, 1504; Stanley of Ely, 1506; Stokesley of London, 1530; Gardiner of Winchester, 1531. Haddan, *Preface to Bramhall*, iii. p. 17; *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 30, *n.*

[3] The certificate of his election at Bow Church was signed by his four consecrators, and is extant in Parker's Register, *Hierarch. Angl.* p. 14.

[4] The mandate for Parker's enthronement was signed on Dec. 31, 1559; he was enthroned Jan. 1, 1560;

eleven[1] years the Roman Catholics in England did not formally withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Anglican Episcopate, it is difficult to see how any really valid objection can be made to the claim of Parker to have been rightly and duly consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury[2].

vi. **The Second Objection** is to the *form* and *matter* of Anglican Ordinations as lacking certain essential ceremonies. The essence, we are told, of valid Ordination, the necessary form and matter, includes at the consecration of a Bishop the delivery to him of the pastoral staff and ring, and at the Ordination of a Priest, the handing to him of the chalice and paten with the words, "Receive the power to offer sacrifice." This omission, it is urged, vitiates the Anglican Ordinal. But it may be replied without fear of contradiction that the delivery of the pastoral staff and ring to a Bishop cannot be traced back further than the eighth century, and the porrection, as it is called, to the Priest of the sacred vessels[3] was unknown to the

and was admitted to the temporalities of his See on March 21 by Royal letters after homage had been made to the queen in the usual manner. See *Patents*, 2 Eliz. p. 14; Strype, *Parker*, Bk. ii. ch. i.

[1] The Diary of Archbishop Parker, preserved in the Library of Corpus Christi College contains the following entry:—"17. Decembr. Anno 1559. Consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuar. Heu! Heu! Domine in quæ tempora servasti me? Jam veni in profundum aquarum et tempestas demersit me. O Domine vim patior, responde pro me et Spiritu Tuo principali confirma me." Strype, *Parker*, Appendix, p. 15, gives extracts from this Diary.

[2] "When," writes Dr Lingard, "we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated, as a brother, with the other consecrated Bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated Bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them, according to seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them; it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body." See Lingard, *History of England*, vol. vi., pp. 329, Appendix; Dalbus, *Les Ordinations Anglicanes*, p. 18. "The result of my investigation," says Dr Döllinger, "is that I have no manner of doubt as to the validity of the Episcopal succession in the English Church." *Bonn Conference* 1874, p. 51.

[3] The delivery of the paten cum oblatis and the calix cum vino followed the chrism, or the anointing of the

Western Church for a thousand years, and is still unknown to the Eastern Church[1]. If, therefore, these ceremonies constitute "the essential matter and form of orders," all the Ordinations of the first thousand years and all those of the Eastern Church also are vitiated. The argument, therefore, from omission proves too much, and it is certain that the further back we go, the simpler do we find all the forms of ordination in all parts of the world, while the real essentials of ordination in Apostolic times were (1) imposition of hands[2] and (2) prayer[3].

vii. **A Third Objection** is that, if the laying on of hands is sufficient matter, the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," without specification of the office of Bishop or Priest, do not constitute a sufficient formula for the validity of the Consecration or Ordination. But neither Scripture nor the Church has prescribed any particular form of words to be used on such occasions, and the introduction of the phrase "for the Office and Work of a Bishop," in the

hands of the priest. The chrism, however, was not in general use till the 9th century, and there is no mention of the porrection of the sacred vessels in the oldest Ordinals. See Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiquities*, ii. p. 515; Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 68, note. The delivery of the chalice and paten and pastoral staff was retained in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., but laid aside in that of 1552.

[1] In the Eastern Church the delivery of the sacred vessels takes place *after* Ordination, and no formula for the delivery is prescribed. The great Roman theologian Morinus in the latter part of the seventeenth century allows that the rite was unknown in the Church for a thousand years. See Walcott's *English Ordinal*, p. 260.

[2] See 1 Tim. iv. 14, and 2 Tim. i. 6. Even Bellarmine allows that the imposition of hands is the essential part of Ordination, and he cites the decree of the Council of Trent, Sess. iv., c. 3, concerning Extreme Unction, where it says that the minister of extreme unction is a Bishop or Priest duly ordained *per manus impositionem*. *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 64.

[3] See Palmer, *Orig. Lit.* ii. p. 304; Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* v. pp. 366 sq. As He ascended, our Lord *lifted up His hands and blessed* His Apostles (Luke xxiv. 50), and this significant action was adopted afterwards by them at Ordinations. Thus Paul and Barnabas were ordained with prayer and laying on of hands (Acts xiii. 3); thus Timothy was consecrated (1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6); thus the Bishops, ordained by the Apostles (Acts xx. 28); thus Deacons were ordained (Acts vi. 3), and Priests (1 Tim. v. 22).

service for the consecration of Bishops, and of the phrase "for the Office and Work of a Priest" in that for the ordering of Priests, which took effect in 1661, removes any objection, at all events, to our present Ordinal. Moreover the form of ordination does not consist merely in the words of consecration[1]. The whole service forms part of it, and the other prayers, which occur therein, distinctly determine the meaning of the action. Furthermore it is to be noticed that the Bishops consecrated according to the Ordinal as it was in the reign of Elizabeth, were in no worse case than were their predecessors. In none of the English Pontificals, except that of Exeter, is there any determining word at the time of the imposition of hands, and the occurrence in the English Ordinal of the charge of S. Paul to Timothy as Bishop (1 Tim. iii. 1—6), shews that it was in the minds of the consecrators of Archbishop Parker to confer on him the authority of a Bishop.

viii. **A Fourth Objection** urged that admitting the imposition of hands and prayer to be sufficient matter and form, the English forms of ordination do not confer the power of offering sacrifice, and are therefore null. But the offering of sacrifice is not, strictly speaking, the *chief end* of the Christian Ministry. When S. Paul has occasion to dwell on the end of the Christian Ministry, he says, *Christ gave some to be Apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ, until we all attain..... unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ*[2] (Eph. iv. 11—13). The Apostle does not mention the

[1] "The form which accompanies the imposition of hands in Episcopal Ordination in the Roman Pontifical itself, is merely this: 'Receive the Holy Ghost'; and the prayer which follows does not directly mention the Episcopal Office." Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 345. Ed. 3, 1842.

[2] Comp. Acts xx. 28.

offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as *the* "end" of the Ministry. Moreover we do not find that all the ancient forms of Ordination expressly convey this power. There is no mention of it in the Ethiopic Ordination rites, in the ancient Coptic forms of Ordination, in the rite of the Syrian Jacobites, or in several of the most ancient Latin Sacramentaries a thousand years old[1]. The functions of the Priesthood are expressed in the Apostolic Constitutions[2] in very general terms, and even Morinus allows that there is no express mention of this power in the most ancient formularies[3]. If it is further objected that the Church of England had no idea of conferring such power because she substituted the present form of Ordination in place of others which expressly mentioned it, it may be replied that the power of sacrificing was only expressly referred to in connection with the *modern* rite of "the porrection of the instruments," which with many other modern rites was discontinued by those who drew up our present Ordinal. The omission, however, certainly did not arise from any denial of the Eucharistic Sacrifice[4] in the primitive and Catholic sense[5].

[1] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 346. Ed. 3, 1842.

[2] Const. Apost. Lib. viii. c. 16, quoted in *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 115.

[3] See *Hierarchia Anglicana*, p. 115.

[4] "Les erreurs de l'Église Anglicane, surtout celles qui ont pour objet le sacerdoce et le sacrifice eucharistique, n'ont-elles pas déteint sur la rédaction de l'Ordinal au point d'en compromettre l'efficacité? Il me semble que, sur ce point, la présomption est en faveur de la thèse anglicane. Il n'y a pas d'hérésies positivement énoncées dans l'Ordinal; tout ce qu'on peut reprocher à ses auteurs est d'en avoir écarté toutes les expressions qui supposent un véritable sacerdoce sacrificateur et un véritable sacrifice eucharistique. Mais c'est là chose plutôt négative; l'Ordinal n'en devient pas positivement hérétique." Review of "De Hierarchia Anglicana" in *La Correspondance Catholique*, 23 Mai, 1895, by Neuter.

[5] As regards the doctrine of Intention, see above pp. 313, 314. Barlow was required to consecrate Parker, and he did so, and we cannot but believe that he really intended to do and to say what he actually did and said in the matter of consecration. The fact that each one of the Bishops present pronounced the consecrating words shews that the whole subject had been cautiously and seriously considered.

ix. **The Objections of the Puritans** are of a very different kind. The Puritans were opposed to the use of the words in the Ordination of Priests, "Receive the Holy Ghost...Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." They alleged that the power of remitting and retaining sins was miraculous, confined to the Apostles, and not to be expected by other Ministers, and further that as man cannot bestow the Spirit of God, it is profane to claim the power to do so. Now the formula "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" is grounded on the words of our Lord to His Apostles on the evening of the world's first Easter-Day, when He said to them, *As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you*[1], and when *He breathed on them*[2] and said *Receive ye the Holy Ghost*[3] (John xx. 21, 22). The words in the original indicate that the gift spoken of was not the personal sanctifying Grace of God in their hearts, nor the miraculous baptism of the Spirit, afterwards bestowed on the day of Pentecost[4], but it was the Grace of Ordination, the right to exercise that Ministry of Reconciliation, which He had rendered effectual by His Resurrection from the dead[5].

[1] On the force of these words, see above under Art. xxiii. pp. 283, 284.

[2] Ἐνεφύσησε. "The breath (πνεῦμα) is an emblem of the Spirit (John iii. 8); and by 'breathing,' as S. Augustine observes, the Lord shewed that the Spirit was not the Spirit of the Father only but also His own. The act is described as one (ἐνεφύσησε), and not repeated. The gift was once for all, not to individuals but to the abiding body." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

[3] The words in the original Greek are λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Here it is to be noticed that the definite article is altogether wanting. The words, therefore, might be translated *Receive ye Holy Spirit*, which would imply not the Holy Spirit in His fulness, but "a gift of the Holy Spirit."

[4] "The Spirit which the Lord now imparted to them was His Spirit, or, as it may be expressed, the Holy Spirit as dwelling in Him. By this He first quickened them, and then sent, according to His promise, the Paraclete to be with them, and to supply all power for the exercise of their different functions. The relation of the Paschal to the Pentecostal gift is therefore the relation of quickening to endowing. The one answers to the power of the Resurrection, and the other to the power of the Ascension (Godet); the one to victory and the other to Sovereignty." Bp Westcott *in loc.*

[5] For, as S. Paul says to the Corin-

Ministry, the right to minister, is one of the gifts of the Spirit (Rom. xii. 7). This, including all that it involves, our Lord bestowed upon the Apostles, and, as we have seen[1], upon all who should come after them. Hence, when the hand of the Bishop is laid upon the head of him whom he ordains, we need not doubt that the *charisma* of God's Spirit is given for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God.

x. **Absolution.** As to the Ministry of Reconciliation no one will dispute that God alone can forgive sins and that no Priest can claim a power, which must obviously belong to Him alone. No one again will dispute that even God cannot forgive all sins, but only the sins of those who truly repent and unfeignedly believe, for these conditions of pardon are inexorably laid down by God Himself. But God is pleased to work through men upon the world of men, and He uses a human Ministry to declare and convey His forgiveness to those, who fulfil the prescribed conditions of that forgiveness, just as He uses the instrumentality of men to preach the word, to teach, to edify, and to comfort. Hence every Bishop, who has authority to ordain, has also authority to declare that "the Ministry of Reconciliation" is committed to the person whom he ordains, and the newly-ordained Priest receives by Christ's own ordinance a divine commission to minister, and at the same time a divine commission duly to exercise the power of pronouncing the absolution of sins on the prescribed conditions of faith and repentance being observed by the recipient[2].

thians, *If Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins* (1 Cor. xv. 17). See Bp Ellicott *in loc.*

[1] See above, p. 284.

[2] As regards the whole subject see a Sermon of Bp Andrewes on S. John xx. 23, preached before the Court in 1600, *Works*, vol. iii. p. 82 ff. Oxford, 1843.

ARTICLE XXXVII.

1563.

De ciuilibus Magistratibus.

Regia Maiestas in hoc Angliæ Regno ac cæteris eius Dominijs, iure summam habet potestatem, ad quam omnium statuum huius Regni siue illi ecclesiastici sunt siue non, in omnibus causis suprema gubernatio pertinet, & nulli externæ iurisdictioni est subiecta, nec esse debet.

Cum Regiæ Maiestati summam gubernationem tribuimus, quibus titulis intelligimus animos quorundam calumniatorum offendi: non damus Regibus nostris aut uerbi Dei aut sacramentorum administrationem, quod etiam Iniunctiones ab Elizabetha Regina nostra nuper æditæ, apertissimè testantur: sed eam tantùm prærogatiuam, quam in sacris scripturis à Deo ipso omnibus pijs Principibus, uidemus semper fuisse attributam, hoc est, ut omnes status atque ordines fidei suæ à Deo commissos, siue illi ecclesiastici sint, siue ciuiles, in officio contineant, & contumaces ac delinquentes, gladio ciuili coërceant.

Romanus Pontifex nullam habet iurisdictionem in hoc regno Angliæ.

Leges Ciuiles possunt Christianos propter capitalia et grauia crimina morte punire.

Christianis licet et ex mandato Magistratus arma portare, et iusta bella administrare.

1571.

Of the Ciuill Magistrates.

The Queenes Maiestie hath the cheefe power in this Realme of Englande, and other her dominions, vnto whom the cheefe gouernment of all estates of this Realme, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Ciuile, in all causes doth apparteine, and is not, nor ought to be subiect to any forraigne iurisdiction.

Where we attribute to the Queenes Maiestie the cheefe gouernment, by whiche titles we vnderstand the mindes of some slaunderous folkes to be offended: we geue not to our princes the ministring either of God's word, or of Sacraments, the which thing the Iniunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queene, doth most plainlie testifie: But that only prerogatiue whiche we see to haue ben geuen alwayes to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God him selfe, that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiasticall or Temporall, and restraine with the ciuill sworde the stubberne and euyll doers.

The bishop of Rome hath no iurisdiction in this Realme of Englande.

The lawes of the Realme may punishe Christian men with death, for heynous and greeuous offences.

It is lawfull for Christian men, at the commaundement of the Magistrate, to weare weapons, and serue in the warres.

i. **Title and Language.** The Title of Article xxxvii. has remained uniform since the original draft in 1553, but the language has undergone considerable modification. As it was first drawn up it began, "The King of England is supreme head in earth, next under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland[1]." This language is nearly identical with that of the Act of Supremacy passed in 1534 in the reign of Henry VIII., in which Henry is acknowledged as "Protector and only Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England," but with the important proviso, "so far as is permitted by the Law of Christ[2]."

ii. **Alteration under Elizabeth.** On the accession of Mary the Acts of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. were repealed. When Elizabeth came to the throne, her first act was to restore to the Crown "the ancient jurisdiction over the State ecclesiastical and spiritual, abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same." The title, however, "Supreme Head of the Church," was never revived, and for it was substituted that of "Supreme Governor of the Church." In an Admonition appended to her injunctions of A.D. 1559 the Queen explained that nothing was meant by this, other than what was acknowledged to be due to "the most noble kings of famous memory," her father and brother[3], and which was of ancient time claimed by the

[1] "Rex Angliæ est supremum caput in terris, post Christum, Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et Hibernicæ." To this one MS. added, "Neque in universo orbe ullum seipso majorem agnoscit a quo sua potestas et autoritas pendeat." Hardwick, *Hist. Art.*, p. 342, *n.*

[2] "It is plain from the recitals in that and also in another Statute of the same year, and from other proofs, that the King did not mean to claim any spiritual office or character, or any power different in its nature from what had often before been asserted as belonging of right to the English Crown." Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 32.

[3] "The legislation of Henry VIII.th's reign against the Pope's pretensions to jurisdiction in this kingdom did but carry to their full consequences, under the circumstances of that time, principles admitted in Anglo-Saxon times, for which Norman and Plantagenet kings had contended, which had been embodied in the acts of their Councils and Parliaments, and in which the

imperial crown of this realm,—"that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what state, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them[1]."

iii. **Analysis.** The present Article, therefore, (i) commences with the assertion that "The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this realm of England and other her dominions," and then (ii) goes on to state that to the Sovereign appertains the chief government of all estates of the Realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, and that she is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction. (iii) Moreover to silence objections, it defines the limits of the government of the sovereign as not extending either (*a*) to the performance of any spiritual function, or (*b*) to the exercise of any prerogative other than that allowed to godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself[2]. (iv) It declares that the government of the sovereign extends to that coercive power, which alike in the Old and the New Testaments is placed in the hands of princes[3]. (v) This done, the Article proceeds to lay down the following points:

Ecclesiastical authorities of the realm had either actively concurred or at least practically acquiesced." Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, pp. 8, 9.

[1] Cardwell's *Doc. Annals*, pp. 199—201. See the comments of Sir Matthew Hale on the *Royal Supremacy*, quoted by Earl Selborne, *Defence of Ch. of England*, pp. 13, 14.

[2] See Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, vol. i. p. 200. 3rd ed. 1842.

[3] Thus it is carefully provided that the civil magistrate is not the source of spiritual as well as civil jurisdiction, and the Church of England "claims to have a spiritual mission and authority, a ministry of the Word and Sacraments, neither derived from nor communicable to the State; and she acknowledges in the Head of the State that power only, over ecclesiastical persons and causes, which she believes to be within the rightful province of all Christian Governments." Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 35.

(α) That the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm:

(β) That no Foreign jurisdiction can interfere with the right of the national sovereign either to (1) inflict capital punishment, or (2) claim the assistance of his soldiers in war.

iv. **The Civil Supremacy** in temporal matters is the foundation of all settled government, and Scripture alike in the Old and the New Testament sanctions the extension of this power, under due and proper limits, to matters ecclesiastical. Thus (α) *In the Old Testament*:—(1) Aaron is subject to Moses (Exod. xxxii. 21, 22); (2) Saul is declared by Samuel to be head of the tribes including Levi (1 Sam. xv. 17); (3) David distributes the priests into twenty-four courses, and makes various regulations as regards the Temple Services (1 Chron. xxiii. 6)[1]; and (4) it is distinctly said that *the priests and Levites departed not from the commandment of Solomon concerning any matter* (2 Chron. viii. 15)[2]. Again (β) *in the New Testament*:—(1) Our Lord directs that all alike are to *render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's* (Luke xx. 25); (2) S. Paul bids *every soul be subject to the higher powers* as being ordained of God (Rom. xiii. 1); (3) S. Peter writes to the Christians of the Dispersion, *Be subject unto every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be unto the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by Him for vengeance on evil doers, and for praise to them that do well* (1 Pet. ii. 13, 14).

v. **The Royal Supremacy.** These passages guide

[1] Similar directions concerning sacred matters are given by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx. 3—13); Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxix. 3—19; and Josiah (2 Chron. xxxiv. 1—13 ff.).

[2] But the king was not allowed to intrude upon the sacred offices of religion, as was shewn by the punishment of Saul (1 Sam. xiii. 8—14), and the punishment of Uzziah for intruding into the Holy Place to burn incense (2 Chron. xxvi. 16 ff.).

us to a right conception of what is meant by the royal supremacy. (i) We do *not* mean, (*a*) a *spiritual* headship, for that belongs to Christ alone; nor (*b*) an *ecclesiastical* headship, such as would empower the sovereign to teach or preach, or administer the Sacraments, or consecrate persons and things, or impose ecclesiastical censures[1]; nor (*c*) an *arbitrary* and *unlimited* supremacy, so that we should be supposed to put our consciences under the uncontrolled guidance of the sovereign. (ii) What we *do* mean is (*a*) that the sovereign must hold some position in the Church and this can only be the highest; (*b*) that for coercive purposes and to preserve the peace of the realm he is over all persons and in all causes supreme; (*c*) that legally and constitutionally he can do nothing concerning the doctrine and discipline of the Church, unless it has received the consent of the clergy and laity, as represented in Convocation and Parliament respectively; (*d*) that he is entitled to those ancient privileges, which belonged to kings and princes in Scripture, to Christian Emperors in primitive times, and to the ancient sovereigns of England, and which empower them "to rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers."

vi. **The Papal Jurisdiction** in the realm of England is claimed on various grounds. It is urged that (i) S. Peter had a supremacy given him over the rest of the Apostles, and over the universal Church; that (ii) he exercised this supremacy as Bishop of Rome for upwards of twenty-five years; that (iii) this supremacy is inherited by the

[1] "It was during the primacy of Archbishop Warham (not Cranmer) that the Convocations of both provinces of Canterbury and York formally acknowledged the king's 'Supreme Headship' of the Church of England." Earl Selborne, *Defence of the Church of England*, p. 32.

Bishops of Rome as his successors; that (iv) England was converted to the Christian Faith by Missionaries from Rome and therefore owes allegiance to the Roman See.

vii. **The Supremacy of S. Peter.** We do not deny that a certain *priority* was conceded to S. Peter by our Lord. We cannot read the New Testament without noticing that (1) his name is placed first in all the catalogues of the Apostles[1]; that (2) he takes the lead in speaking and acting for the rest[2]; that (3) he is peculiarly honoured in conjunction with S. James and S. John[3]; that (4) our Lord makes to him a special promise as regards His Church[4]; that (5) after the Ascension he is

[1] Matt. x. 2; Mark iii. 16; Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13.

[2] Matt. xix. 27; Luke xii. 41; Matt. xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29.

[3] Mark v. 37; Luke viii. 51; Mark ix. 2; Luke ix. 28.

[4] "And I say unto thee (*κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω*) that thou art Peter (*ὅτι σὺ εἶ* Πέτρος), and upon *this rock* (*ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*) I will build My Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it, and I will give thee (*δώσω σοι*) the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Matt. xvi. 18, 19). Amongst the Fathers there is no fixity of interpretation as regards the meaning here of the Rock. Different interpretations are given by many in different parts of their works. Some apply it to S. Peter himself; others to the faith he confessed; others to Christ, acknowledged by the Apostle to be God and Man. S. Augustine himself varies in his interpretation. In his earlier expositions he acknowledges he had applied the words to S. Peter, but in his later ones to Christ (S. Aug. *Retract.* i. 21). It is noticeable that our Lord does not say *ἐπί σοι οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν* but *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ*. The expression points, not so much to the person of the Apostle himself, as to something to which his name (Πέτρος) bore witness, and which had evinced itself in his glorious confession. This much at any rate seems clear;—(α) The Apostle obviously could not be the Rock in any sense which trenched on the prerogative of Christ Himself, Who is the *foundation stone*, θεμέλιος (1 Cor. iii. 11), *the chief corner stone*, ἀκρογωνιαῖος (Eph. ii. 20), binding the parts of the building of His Church together; (β) still S. Peter by virtue of his faith and confession had a primacy, not the primacy of *absolute sovereignty*, but "the primacy of historical inauguration," as Bp Lightfoot terms it: (γ) and so in the Apostolic records he appears using the keys and opening the gates at each successive stage in the progress of the Church. The same courageous faith, which prompted this confession and called forth the promise of Christ, enables him to receive into the Church the three thousand on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 41); to open the gates to the Samaritans (Acts viii. 14, 16); to admit the Gentile Cornelius to Christian Baptism (Acts x. 46, 47).

signally prominent in the founding of the Church. But *priority of order* does not involve *preeminence of jurisdiction.* Had it been so, we surely should have found in the New Testament some traces of such preeminence being asserted and claimed. But so far from it,

(α) *In the Gospels,*

(i) We never find our Lord giving S. Peter himself apart from the rest of the Apostles any title of special honour;

(ii) On the contrary we find Him protesting against any claims to preeminence, and saying, *Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant* (Matt. xx. 27); *Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren* (Matt. xxiii. 8);

(iii) Again in the solemn delegation of ministerial authority after His resurrection, He says to the whole Apostolic body in general, *As the Father hath sent Me, even so send I you* (ὑμᾶς, John xx. 21)[1].

But then, as though to shew that the Church was not founded on the personality of S. Peter, he vanishes from our sight, and another assumes the chief place in his stead, of whom, not of S. Peter, S. Augustine says "Ipse (Paulus) *caput et princeps* Apostolorum" and again "(Paulus) tanti Apostolatus meruit *principatum.*" See S. Aug. *De Pecc. Meritis et Remissione* ii. 20; Bp Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt. i. Vol. ii., pp. 487 sqq.

[1] *Again He says Whose soever sins* YE *forgive, they are forgiven unto them, whose soever sins* YE *retain, they are retained* (John xx. 23); *Go* YE, *and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them...teaching them* (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). There is nothing here to indicate that what the Apostles had, they had not directly from Christ, but indirectly from Christ through Peter. See Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 74. "Our Lord's words were addressed to all the Apostles; no distinction was made; all were alike addressed, and all were therefore given the same Apostolical authority...Every Apostle was sent *as Jesus Christ was sent* by the Father; that is with the plenitude of supreme power; every Apostle was authorized to remit sins, and to teach all nations. Nothing conceivable by human imagination can surpass the grandeur and the magnitude of this Mission and these powers." Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, ii. p. 480.

(β) *In the Acts,*

(i) We find S. Peter actually *sent* with S. John by the other Apostles to Samaria (Acts viii. 14—16);

(ii) The appeal made at the Council of Jerusalem is not made to S. Peter, but to *the Apostles and elders* (Acts xv. 13, 19);

(iii) S. Peter did not preside at the Council, but this position was occupied by James *the Lord's brother*, and first bishop of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 19)[1];

(iv) S. Peter retires after this altogether into the background of the sacred history, while S. Paul becomes the prominent figure.

(γ) *In the Epistles,*

(i) S. Paul instead of going up after his conversion to S. Peter as the supreme head of the Church[2], waits some time, and only after a considerable interval receives from him *the right hand of fellowship* (Gal. ii. 9);

(ii) The same Apostle on one occasion actually *withstands S. Peter to the face*, because *he stood condemned*[3] (Gal. ii. 11), and he severely re-

[1] See Appendix to Bp Lightfoot's *Commentary on the Galatians*, "S. Paul and the Three."

[2] Consider again the words of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, *Paul an Apostle, not from man, neither through man* (Gal. i. 1); *I did not receive it* (the Gospel) *from man, neither was I taught it* (Gal. i. 12); *they of repute* (i.e. the pillar Apostles, James and Cephas and John) *imparted nothing to me* (Gal. ii. 6); *the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter* (Gal. ii. 7). "There is no sort of dependence of S. Paul on S. Peter which these words do not exclude." Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 80, *n.*

[3] Κατεγνωσμένος ἦν not "reprehensible," but "condemned." His conduct carried its own condemnation with it. Comp. John iii. 18; Rom. xiv. 23. "The condemnation is not the verdict of the bystanders, but the verdict of the act itself." Bp Lightfoot *in loc.*; see also Bp Ellicott's *Commentary* on the passage.

bukes as schismatics those who said, *I am of Cephas* (1 Cor. i. 12);

(iii) Moreover in his own Epistles S. Peter himself never claims preeminence or superiority over his fellow-Apostles or the Church. He calls himself an *elder* amongst elders (1 Pet. v. 1); an *Apostle* amongst other Apostles (1 Pet. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1); he gives no hint that he stands in any special relation to *the chief Shepherd* (1 Pet. v. 4) beyond that in which the other Apostles stood, any more than S. John does, when he speaks of the *twelve foundations* of the Church, equal and coordinate, as *the twelve Apostles of the Lamb*[1] (Rev. xxi. 14).

We conclude, then, from these three lines of argument that though it cannot be disputed that our Lord promised to build His Church upon S. Peter, as the great Confessor of His Divinity, there is no warrant for the notion that this gave the Apostle preeminence of jurisdiction over the others, and so over the Universal Church.

viii. **S. Peter's Bishopric at Rome,** which is said to have lasted upwards of twenty-five years, really involves an appeal to history, and to history we can go. The martyrdom, then, of S. Peter at Rome, which may be accepted as authentic[2], cannot have taken place before A.D. 68, when Nero was Emperor. Now twenty-five years[3] subtracted from this date brings us to A.D. 43 as the com-

[1] Καὶ τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχον θεμελίους δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα ὀνόματα τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρνίου, Rev. xxi. 14. Observe the studied repetition of the word δώδεκα.

[2] Tertullian, *De Præscript.* 36, *Scorp.* 15, and also Origen in Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 1, refer to the tradition that he was crucified at Rome with his head downwards, and that S. Paul suffered also at the same time.

[3] It is in Jerome's version of the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, Lib. ii. anno 43, that we find the first distinct statement that S. Peter went to Rome in the year A.D. 43, and remained there for 25 years as Bishop of the Church in that city.

mencement of the Petrine episcopate[1]; and we have a history of the period from A.D. 30—60 in the Acts of the Apostles, but there is nowhere to be found a single hint in it of the Apostle's presence in the capital of the West. In A.D. 58 S. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Church of Rome[2], but he preserves an absolute silence as to the episcopate there of his brother Apostle[3]. Between A.D. 60 and A.D. 66 he wrote at least five Epistles from Rome, but in none of these does he allude to the presence of S. Peter. In the two Epistles written by that Apostle himself he lets fall no word, which indicates any episcopal jurisdiction at Rome. The only passage which can be alleged to have any possible reference to the Eternal City is the verse, in which the Apostle writes, *There saluteth you she that is in Babylon, elect together with you; and so doth Marcus my son* (1 Pet. v. 13)[4]. But, even if "Babylon" here means Rome,

[1] "I cannot find," writes Bp Lightfoot, "that any writers of the first two centuries and more speak of S. Peter as bishop of Rome.....The language of Irenæus (iii. 3. 3) is explicit. He describes the Church of Rome as founded by the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul, who appointed Linus bishop".... "After him came Linus; after Linus, Anencletus; after Anencletus in the *third* place from the Apostles Clement is elected to the bishopric, and the others, when any numbers are given, are numbered accordingly." *Apost. Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. pp. 501, 502.

[2] In this Epistle S. Paul obviously takes for granted that no Apostle had yet reached Rome (Rom. xv. 20).

[3] "If silence can ever be regarded as decisive, its verdict must be accepted in this case. S. Paul could not have written as he writes to the Romans (i. 11, sq., xv. 20—24) if they had received even a short visit from an Apostle, more especially if that Apostle were S. Peter." Bp Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. p. 491.

[4] Ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή, καὶ Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου =*the fellow-elect in Babylon greeteth you, and so doth Marcus my son* (1 Pet. v. 13). The interpretations of the words are various. Some would understand them to refer to some sister or Christian lady, well known to S. Peter's converts. But the context Ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή is unnatural as the description of a person, and several early authorities (including ℵ) add Ἐκκλησία. If a "fellow-elect Church" is intended, the mention of S. Mark, S. Peter's "companion and interpreter" (Eusebius *H. E.* iii. 39), points to Rome, where S. Mark composed his Gospel, and where the latest notices in the New Testament represent him either as staying or invited to visit (Col. iv. 10; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 11). Moreover the Crucifixion of S. Peter (John xxi. 18) is always connected by tradition with Rome, and with no other place. Bp Lightfoot considers

there is no allusion to any jurisdiction in that City[1]. While, then, it is probable that the Apostle found his way to the Capital of the West and there received the martyr's crown[2], the supposition that he remained for twenty-five years bishop of the Church of Rome involves insuperable chronological and historical difficulties.

ix. **The Primacy of the successors of S. Peter** seems to be involved in and affected by the doubts respecting the Apostle's bishopric at Rome[3]. If the Ultramontane view of S. Peter's privilege was recognised in early times, it is difficult to account for several historical facts. Thus

(*a*) In A.D. 95 Clement of Rome writes to the Corinthians, and does not give the slightest indication of this privilege;

(*β*) In A.D. 108 S. Polycarp consults Anicetus about the keeping of Easter, but he does not consider himself bound to defer to his authority as *per se* conclusive on the point[4];

this to be supported by the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians c. 5, and by that of Ignatius to the Romans c. 4. *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. pp. 491, 492.

[1] Irenæus says that S. Peter and S. Paul preached at Rome, and laid the foundation of the Church there, and after so doing "committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate." But the Greek word here used cannot be made to mean "handed on" or "handed down," as if Linus succeeded either or both of them after they died.

[2] Bishop Lightfoot considers that S. Peter arrived at Rome in the latter part of A.D. 64, during S. Paul's absence after his first imprisonment. The Neronian persecution broke out soon afterwards, and he would be one of the most prominent victims. Ancient tradition states that S. Peter was buried in the Vatican, S. Paul on the Ostian Way. "The Vatican gardens were the scene of the hideous festivities, in which the victims of the fire suffered, and amongst these (we may assume) was S. Peter, A.D. 64. On the other hand an isolated victim who was put to death some years later (say A.D. 67), as was presumably S. Paul's case, might meet his death anywhere." *Apostolic Fathers*, Pt i. Vol. ii. pp. 497, 498.

[3] There is not a syllable in the three texts alleged to embody the Petrine Privilege (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 31, 32; John xxi. 15—17) which empowers S. Peter *to convey the privilege, whatever be its nature, to any other person*, and there is no evidence producible that he ever did confer and transmit his peculiar privilege and authority.

[4] Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* iv. 14; v. 24. Neither bishop would yield to the other, but the two parted in peace.

(γ) In A.D. 196 Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, disputes with Victor, Bishop of Rome, on the same point, and as they cannot agree, Victor excommunicates him, and for so doing, although Bishop of the capital of the West, he is rebuked by a number of bishops, and amongst them by Irenæus himself[1], "Victor stood reproved. His excommunication failed[2]."

(δ) In A.D. 255 Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, and other African bishops come into collision with Pope Stephen on the question of heretical baptism, and when the latter refuses to recognise them, and renounces communion with the African Churches, they stoutly express their disapproval of his attempt to make himself a "bishop of bishops";

(ε) In A.D. 424 the bishops of Africa, with S. Augustine at their head, write strongly to Pope Celestinus, denying his right to interfere with their jurisdiction, and complaining that he had violated the Canon of the Council of Nicæa, which directed that causes between bishops and clergy shall be heard by their own metropolitan, and not carried elsewhere[3];

(ζ) Above all, Pope Gregory the Great vehemently protested against the bishop of Constantinople[4],

[1] It is important to observe that Eusebius recognises no special "Petrine privilege," on the strength of which Victor was justified in taking the course he did. *Hist. Eccl.* v. 24.

[2] Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, p. 91.

[3] See Laud, *Conference with Fisher*, p. 166; Crackanthorpe, *Def. Eccl. Angl.* p. 176; Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.* VII. xii. i.

[4] As S. Cyprian had done before him; "Neque enim quisquam nostrûm *Episcopum se Episcoporum* constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suas adegit, quando habeat *omnis Episcopus* pro licentia libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium." S. Cyprian in *Concil. Carthag.* vii.

for claiming the title of "universal bishop," and not only declares such an assumption to be arrogant, indeed, and schismatical, but affirms that he who made it was *a forerunner of Antichrist*[1].

x. **Decisions of Councils** speak with no less certain voice on the same subject. The sixth Canon of the Council of Nicæa, A.D. 325, places the Roman Bishop on a level with those of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria. The eighth Canon of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, forbids any bishop to invade another's province, which had not been from the beginning under his jurisdiction[2]. The twenty-eighth Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, confirms the decrees of the Council of Constantinople, and gives in the West privileges to "Old Rome" as the seat of Empire, and to the see of "New Rome," or Constantinople, because that city was acknowledged as the seat of Empire in the East[3]. Evidently the Roman patriarch was considered to have no more jurisdiction given to him than the patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople; the first place was assigned to Rome as being the imperial City; next came Constantinople as being "New Rome"; and every bishop was expressly forbidden to invade any Diocese, which had not from the first been subject to him and to his predecessors. Of any divine right of the Roman See to

[1] "Ego autem fidenter dico quia quisquis se universalem sacerdotem vocat, seu vocari desiderat, *in elatione suâ Antichristum præcurrit*, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit." Greg. Magn. *Epist.* vii. 33; "Si unus Patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur." Ibid. v. 43.

[2] See Dr Bright's *Notes on the Canons*.

[3] Gore, *Rom. Cath. Claims*, pp. 97, 98. "Nothing can be more certain than that the Bishops, who enacted this Canon, did not regard the privileges of Rome as part of the divine and essential constitution of the Church; nothing is more clear than that the primacy of Rome is a 'primacy of honour,' and that the claims of Rome to supremacy were not regarded by the Eastern Church as part of the Catholic faith." Dr Bright, *Waymarks in Church History*, pp. 223, 224.

special preeminence and jurisdiction over other Churches the Councils give no hint. Political causes chiefly led to the preeminence of the Roman Church and its bishop. All the roads in the world led to Rome; all nations were represented there; the early bishops of Rome possessed the instinct of government more strongly than their contemplative brethren of the East; and the majesty of the eternal City exercised a mysterious spell over the minds of men, as the one apostolic See of Western Europe.

xi. **The Conversion of England.** Another claim, however, to direct rights of jurisdiction over England is based on the fact that Pope Gregory the Great won over the country to the Christian Faith. But to this it may be well replied that there is no precedent in early Church history for such an argument. It nowhere appears that a Church, which succeeded in any Missionary effort, acquired permanent jurisdiction over the country it converted[1]. If this was the case, Jerusalem would be the Mistress, as well as the Mother of all Churches. Again, there was an ancient and flourishing Church in England long before the arrival of S. Augustine[2], and after his arrival the British succession[3] continued for some time side by side with the Roman. While it is true that S. Augustine won over the

[1] "The African Church was according to Tertullian, *De Præscr. Hæreticorum*, xxxvi. and Cyprian, *Epist.* xlv. both high authorities on the subject, planted from Rome, yet the Church formally repudiated the authority of the Bishop of Rome in A. D. 253, and again in 419—422. Moreover, the Churches of Gaul were certainly founded by Missionaries from Asia Minor, yet the Churches of Asia Minor never claimed jurisdiction over them." Denny, *Anglican Orders*, S.P.C.K., p. 222.

[2] Tertullian speaks of "Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita." Eusebius, *Præp. Evang.* iii. 7, speaks of Britain joining in the worship of the true God, while S. Alban was martyred at Verulam under Diocletian 300 years before the landing of Augustine. Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* I. 6. 7.

[3] At the Synod of Arles, A.D. 314, three British Bishops were present, and British prelates were also present at the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347. See Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Documents*, Vol. i.

Saxon inhabitants of Kent and some other portions of the country, the conversion of by far the largest part was brought about by Scotch and Irish Missionaries, who received no Mission for this purpose from Rome at all. To these missionaries, indeed, the Christianising of all the north, west, and centre of England is due[1], and as Rome never gave mission to these bodies of teachers, she cannot claim jurisdiction over regions which they won over to the Faith.

xii. **Capital Punishment.** Having thus justified the position that it is not within the right of the sovereign to make over the liberties of the people or the Church to any foreign power, the Article proceeds to assert the right of every independent Christian state, (i) to inflict capital punishment, and (ii) to engage in just and righteous wars. Capital punishment was deemed by some in the sixteenth century, as it is by not a few now, to be inconsistent with the spirit of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, wherein He forbids men *to resist him that is evil*[2], and directs *whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also* (Matt. v. 39), and again says, *All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword*[3] (Matt. xxvi. 52). But here undoubtedly our Lord is dealing with the behaviour of indi-

[1] See Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 94—96; Bp Lightfoot, *Leaders in the Northern Church*, p. 11. "Augustine," the Bishop writes, "was the Apostle of Kent, but Aidan was the Apostle of England." We may perhaps not form the highest estimate of the success of S. Augustine's Mission, but still it effected much. "Practically his landing had renewed the union with the western world which that of Hengist had destroyed. The new England was admitted into the older commonwealth of nations. The civilisation, art, letters, which had fled before the sword of the English Conquest, returned with the Christian Faith." Green's *History of the English People*, i. p. 42.

[2] Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ. Here the words τῷ πονηρῷ may be translated "him that is evil," as in the R.V., or "evil" as in the Margin.

[3] Οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν. They who take the sword "of their own motion, without authority from God, who alone gives commission to bear the sword (Matt. xxvi. 52), shall perish by the sword of divine retribution." Bp C. Wordsworth *in loc.* See also Lange's Comm. *in loc.* (T. & T. Clark).

vidual Christians, not with states or communities or the magistrates of any country[1]. Under the Patriarchal Dispensation we find capital punishment was enjoined. *Whoso sheddeth man's blood*, we read, *by man shall his blood be shed* (Gen. ix. 6). This commandment, applicable to the whole human race, was not repealed under the Mosaic Law, and under the New Dispensation we have S. Paul upholding the authority of the magistrate to inflict the penalty of death. *He beareth not the sword in vain*, he writes to the Romans, *for he is the minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil* (Rom. xiii. 4). If this was true of heathen magistrates, much more is it true of Christian authorities. Violations of justice differ in kind and degree. It is only reasonable that penalties should differ also. The extreme violation of justice is wilful murder. The corresponding extreme penalty is capital punishment, which is necessary for the protection of society.

xiii. **The Right of War.** As with capital punishment, so with the right of war, some of our Lord's words seem decisive against its lawfulness. But again it is to be noticed that He is dealing not with nations or governments, but with individuals, and laying down general *principles* of action. War is a necessary evil to be entered upon for the averting of greater evils[2]. Wars for revenge and for mere glory are unquestionably unworthy of

[1] "The administration of justice is not only of importance to individuals whose rights are thus personally secured, but to the whole civil community. For this reason, legal institutions must be absolutely maintained against all caprice and despotism.... Its penal legislation, and the recognition and validity given thereto, is a nation's clearest expression of its consciousness of justice, and therewith of its moral consciousness of the authority of law, of duty and responsibility, of accountability and guilt." Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. p. 176. E. T.

[2] "The true vocation of war is to serve as a means of preventing injustice and violence by physical force and of extorting what justice demands." Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. 231.

Christian states and Christian men[1]. But wars for the assertion of national independence, wars for the protection of people's life and liberty, are not opposed to the will of God, unless we are to believe that the Gospel was designed to condone the supremacy of the violent and unscrupulous. The testimony of Scripture seems to be clear on this point. For in the Old Testament we find the Jews[2] constantly engaged in war, and that often by the direct command of God[3]. And in the New Testament we find John the Baptist, so far from ordering the soldiers, who came to his baptism, to lay down their arms and quit their profession, bidding them *do violence to no man, neither exact anything wrongfully, and be content with their wages* (Luke iii. 14). Again our Lord heals the servant of the heathen centurion, and instead of ordering him to give up his calling, commends his faith as exceeding any he had found in Israel (Matt. viii. 10). S. Peter again instructs and baptizes Cornelius, but does not demand of him either before or after his baptism that he shall quit the army or give up his profession (Acts x. 34—45). Lastly S. Paul not only draws a parallel between the armour of the soldier and the panoply of the Christian, without any hint that the soldier's calling is wrong in itself (Eph. vi. 10—17), but he actually commends the prudence and self-denial of the soldier to the imitation of Timothy himself (2 Tim. ii. 4).

[1] It is to be observed that the Latin of the Article has "*justa* bella administrare," but there is no equivalent for *justa* in the English translation.

[2] On the exterminating wars of the Old Testament see Mozley, *Lectures on the Old Testament*, Lect. iv.

[3] "If a one-sided pessimist view regards only the many terrors and devastations of every war, the horrors of the battle-field, the sorrows brought upon families, the towns burnt, the cornfields trampled on, and the demoniacal passions let loose, we must not overlook the fact that war has also its arousing and purifying effects. It arouses a slumbering patriotism, and calls citizens from the luxurious enjoyments of peace, and from petty and selfish interests, to sacrifices and self-denial for the common cause. It awakens in many a lively consciousness of the perishableness and insecurity of human affairs, teaches many to pray, and humbly submit to the Lord of Hosts, whose just judgments may be executed upon earth even by means of war." Martensen, *Christian Ethics*, ii. p. 233, 4.

Article XXXVIII.

1563.

Christianorum bona non sunt communia.

Facultates & bona Christianorum non sunt communia quoad ius & possessionem, vt quidam Anabaptistæ falso iactant. Debet tamen quisque de hijs quæ possidet, pro facultatum ratione, pauperibus eleemosynas benigne distribuere.

1571.

Of Christian mens goodes which are not common.

The ryches and goodes of Christians are not common, as touching the ryght, title, and possession of the same, as certayne Anabaptistes do falsely boast. Notwithstandyng euery man ought of suche thinges as he possesseth, liberally to geue almes to the poore, accordyng to his habilitie.

i. **Connection.** The previous Article dealt with the Anabaptist objections to capital punishment and the right of Christians to carry arms. The present Article deals with another erroneous doctrine of the same sect[1], who held that the goods of Christian men were common to all alike, and pushed their peculiar doctrines so far as to leave no man anything which he could call his own[2].

ii. **Analysis.** The Article asserts two things:—

(1) That the riches and goods of Christian men are not common, as touching the right, title, and possession of the same;

[1] "Excludetur etiam ab eisdem Anabaptistis inducta bonorum et possessionum communitas, quam tantopere urgent, ut nemini quicquam relinquant proprium et suum." Reformatio Legum, *De hæresibus*, c. 14, "With them the doctrine was a source, not so much of personal self-denial, as of efforts to subvert civil government and the whole framework of society; and it was not therefore to be treated as an innocent enthusiasm, but to be denounced as a dangerous error." Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 830.

[2] "The idea of property has been challenged in modern times by such communists as St Simon, Fourier, and Proudhon, who boldly stake the matter on the apparent paradox that it is property that is the theft." Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 791.

(2) That nevertheless every man ought to give liberally of such things as he possesseth to the poor, according to his ability.

iii. **The Teaching of Scripture.** It is true that our Lord in several passages of the Gospels dwells on the danger of riches, and exhorts His disciples to a renunciation of worldly wealth[1]. And it is beyond doubt that in the earliest ages of the Church, the first believers *had all things common* (Acts ii. 44, 45), and *sold their possessions and goods, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the Apostles' feet, and distribution was made unto each according as anyone had need* (Acts ii. 45; iv. 34, 35)[2]. But on the other hand it is to be borne in mind that this community of goods was not even then absolute or compulsory. S. Peter says to Ananias respecting the piece of land he pretended to have sold, *while it remained, did it not remain thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thy power*[3]*?* (Acts v. 4). His sin lay not in the retaining of his goods, but in pretending to give all while he kept back a part. Again, Mary, the mother of John Mark, had a house at Jerusalem, and practised no little hospitality (Acts xii. 12)[4].

[1] Comp. Matt. v. 42, *Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away;* vi. 19, *Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven;* and see the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 19—25.

[2] Comp. for the state of things somewhat later Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 14, 67; *Didache*, 1. 4; Hermæ *Pastor*, *Vis.* iii. 9.

[3] "Si nolles vendere, quis te cogeret? Si velles offerre dimidium, quis exigeret totum?" S. Aug. *Sermo* 148.

[4] There was no formal community of goods and abolition of private property in the early Jerusalem Church. There was a common purse for supporting the needy, into which many rich persons put the proceeds of the sale of their estates (Acts iv. 34 *sqq.*), while everyone was allowed to possess his own property (Acts xii. 12). There was also a community of the daily use of all worldly possessions (Acts iv. 32), and when the Church assumed a larger scale, this community of use developed into the active charity and hospitality upon which S. Paul insists (Rom. xii. 13; xv. 26), and the existence of which is quite evident from the

iv. **A Strict Community** of goods would render the sixth and eighth commandments superfluous, and would be in direct opposition to many exhortations of our Lord and His Apostles. Thus

(i) Christ bids us *give alms* (Matt. vi. 4; x. 42); *make friends by means*[1] *of the mammon of unrighteousness* (Luke xvi. 9); *call the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind to our feasts* (Luke xiv. 13), *feed the hungry and clothe the naked* (Matt. xxv. 35);

(ii) Again, S. Paul bids us *as we have opportunity, work that which is good* (Gal. vi. 10); *be given to hospitality* (Rom. xii. 13); *communicate to the necessity of the saints* (Rom. xii. 13); *lay by in store as God hath prospered us* (1 Cor. xvi. 2);

(iii) And S. Peter exhorts his converts *to use hospitality one to another without murmuring* (1 Pet. iv. 9).

v. **The Right of Property.** Now all these exhortations acknowledge the strongest obligations to abundant and liberal almsgiving. But it would be impossible to obey them, if a strict and absolute community of goods was enforced. By the very terms, in which they are expressed, they presuppose the existence of distinct possessions in the hands of members of the Church, and leave to the conscience of each man the extent to which he shall give liberally in alms to the poor and needy.

writings of the early Christian Fathers, or, to put it otherwise, it was the application to very simple and exceptional circumstances of the distinctively Christian virtue of ἀγάπη. Comp. Döllinger, *First Age of the Church*, ii. pp. 240, 241; Shirley, *The Church in the Apostolic Age*, p. 7.

[1] Ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας. Ἐκ here may be rendered either (1) *by means of*, or (2) *out of*. See R.V. *in loc.*

ARTICLE XXXIX.

1563.

Licet Christianis Jurare.

Qvemadmodum iuramentum uanum & temerarium à Domino nostro Iesu Christo, & Apostolo eius Iacobo Christianis hominibus interdictum esse fatemur: ita Christianorum religionem minimè prohibere censemus, quin iubente Magistratu, in causa fidei & charitatis, iurare liceat, modò id fiat iuxta Prophetæ doctrinam, in iustitia, in iudicio, & ueritate.

1571.

Of a Christian mans othe.

As we confesse that vayne and rashe swearing is forbidden Christian men by our lord Jesus Christe, and James his Apostle: So we iudge that Christian religion doth not prohibite, but that a man may sweare when the Magistrate requireth, in a cause of faith and charitie, so it be done accordyng to the prophetes teaching, in iustice, iudgement, and trueth.

i. **Connection.** The Thirty-ninth Article, like the previous one, is aimed at the fanaticism of the Anabaptists, who, after the example of the Waldenses of the Middle Ages, and the Quakers of modern times, had such scruples on the subject of taking oaths, that they denied the propriety of their being exacted even in a court of justice.

ii. **Oaths.** When the early Christians were called upon to swear before heathen magistrates, they were naturally required to use idolatrous oaths. This was abhorrent to them and produced a dread of swearing altogether[1]. Still, as we learn from Tertullian, while they abhorred idolatrous oaths, they would occasionally swear by "the safety of the Emperor," though not by his genius,

[1] Περὶ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ὀμνύναι ὅλως, τἀληθῆ δὲ λέγειν ἀεί, οὕτως παρεκελεύσατο, Μὴ ὀμόσητε ὅλως. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 16.

deeming the genii no better than demons[1]. Later, about A.D. 390, Vegetius informs us "that they were wont to swear by God, and Christ, and the Holy Spirit[2], and the Majesty of the Emperor[3]." There was, however, without doubt much scruple amongst the early Christians on the subject of swearing. Clement of Alexandria[4] considered it an indignity for a Christian to be put upon his oath, as disparaging his fidelity, and says that he ought to avoid swearing, saying only "Yea and Nay." To this we may add the testimony of Lactantius, who says that a Christian will never perjure himself, lest he mock God; nor indeed will he swear at all, lest he fall by accident or carelessly into perjury[5]. Still in matters of great moment it was not thought wrong to take an oath; and even S. Athanasius[6] required of the Emperor Constantius that his accusers should be put upon their oaths[7].

iii. **Idle and Vain Swearing.** What Scripture is specially directed against is idle and vain swearing[8]. Such

[1] "Sed et juramus, sicut non per genios Cæsarum, ita per salutem eorum, quæ est augustior omnibus geniis. Nescitis genios dæmonas dici?" Tertull. *Apol.* c. 32.

[2] "Jurant autem per Deum, et per Christum, et per Spiritum Sanctum, et per Majestatem Imperatoris." Veget. *Institutio sui Militaris*, i. 5. See Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, *sub voce* Oath, ii. 1416.

[3] Compare the oath of Joseph, Gen. xlii. 16, "By the life of Pharaoh," *νὴ τὴν ὑγίειαν Φαραώ*, LXX.

[4] Clem. *Stromat.* vii. 8, p. 861, ed. Oxon. 1715.

[5] "Hic non perjurabit, ne Deum ludibrio habeat; sed ne jurabit quidem; ne quando, vel necessitate, vel consuetudine, in perjuriam cadat." Lactant. *Epitome*, c. 6.

[6] Athanasius mentions the oath, *ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου Αὐγούστου*, *Ep. ad Monachos*, i. p. 866.

[7] *Apol. ad Constant.* i. p. 678. "In the conference between the Catholics and Donatists in the time of Honorius the emperor's delegate swore to judge impartially by the marvellous mystery of the Trinity, by the Sacrament of the Incarnation, and by the emperor's safety." Harl. *Conc.* i. 1052. Smith's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities*, ii. 1416.

[8] The use of oaths in ordinary conversation was so common at Antioch that of the twenty-one homilies, which S. Chrysostom preached to the people of Antioch after the imperial statues had been thrown down, there is not one in which allusion is not made to this evil practice. "We shall preach to you," he says, "the whole week respecting oaths," and in one of his sermons he threatens to exclude all swearers from partaking of the Holy Mysteries. *Ad Pop. Antioch*, *Hom.* iv. 6; vi. 7.

swearing is forbidden alike by our Lord and by S. James. The Jews in our Lord's time seem to have thought they might swear as much as they chose, so long as they did not forswear themselves. But He, going deeper than the mere letter of the Commandment, bids His disciples abstain from swearing, either by heaven, or earth, or Jerusalem, or the Temple, or their heads. *Let your speech*, He says, *be Yea, Yea; Nay, Nay* (Matt. v. 33—37), and S. James (James v. 12) almost repeats in his Epistle the words of his Master, and he evidently regards rash and profane swearing in ordinary conversation as being thoroughly opposed to the Gospel of Christ.

iv. **An Oath in a Court of Justice.** But while vain and rash swearing is thus forbidden, it is allowable on solemn and important occasions, and especially in a court of justice, to take an oath. For

(α) When Caiaphas solemnly adjured our Lord to state whether or no He was "the Son of the Blessed," He did not refuse to plead to such an adjuration, but answered at once (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64)[1];

(β) S. Paul frequently in very weighty matters calls God to witness, which is essentially the same thing as taking an oath. Thus he writes to the Corinthians, *I protest by that glorying in you*[2], *which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily* (1 Cor. xv. 31), and again, *The God and Father of the Lord Jesus, He who is blessed for evermore, knoweth that I lie not* (2 Cor. xi. 31)[3];

[1] "This one argument seems to be a host in itself. Our Lord consented to be put upon His oath. Oaths therefore before a civil tribunal cannot be forbidden to His disciples." Bp Browne *On the Articles*, p. 837.

[2] Νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἡμῶν. See the R.V. translation of this verse.

[3] Compare also Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor.

(γ) Again, in the Epistle to the Hebrews the Almighty Himself is represented as swearing (Heb. iii. 11), and the writer of the Epistle compares this with the swearing common among men, saying, *Men swear by the greater: and in every dispute of theirs the oath is final for confirmation* (Heb. vi. 16[1]).

v. **Conclusion.** These examples justify on solemn and important occasions, and especially in a court of justice, the legal confirming of an assertion by a solemn attestation in the sight of God. The Article itself quotes the words of a prophet in justification of such a course. *Thou shalt swear*, we read in Jeremiah, *the Lord liveth, in truth, in judgment, and in righteousness* (Jer. iv. 2). Three conditions are here stated to be requisite to a legitimate oath, *righteousness, judgment, and truth. Righteousness*, that the thing be lawful and honest, and so the Name of God be not adduced in confirmation of injustice or sin; *judgment*, in that the oath be not taken without necessity or grave cause; and *truth*, that the thing be true, or at least on reasonable grounds and *bonâ fide* believed to be true, so that the Holy Name be not brought forward to testify to a lie, which were perjury and a great sin[2]. An oath so taken is not only no sin but a religious act. *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God*, said Moses, *and by His Name shalt thou swear* (Deut. x. 20).

xi. 10; xii. 19; Gal. i. 20; Phil. i. 8. Such solemn appeals were usual in the earliest times. God Himself *sware unto Abraham* (Gen. xxii. 16); Abraham swears by God to deal kindly with Abimelech (Gen. xxi. 23, 24); so also does Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 31); and Jacob swears solemnly to Laban (Gen. xxxi. 53).

[1] Καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος, Heb. vi. 16. See R.V. translation.

[2] See Bp Forbes *On the Articles*, p. 803.

APPENDIX.

I.

THE LAMBETH ARTICLES.

i. DURING the Marian persecutions many English divines sought refuge on the Continent and there became associated with the leading Swiss reformers, who were strongly addicted to the predestinarian views of Calvin. On their return to England in Queen Elizabeth's reign they propagated widely the system of Geneva, and entrenched themselves firmly in the University of Cambridge, where they enlisted the services of not a few zealous, able, and determined men in opposing the whole system of the English Church. Of this party Thomas Cartwright, fellow of Trinity, became the acknowledged leader, and his appointment to the Margaret Professorship of Divinity in 1569 increased his influence. After some little time another pronounced advocate of predestinarian views was found in Dr Whitaker, a keen polemic and Regius Professor of Divinity, and under his influence and that of others holding similar opinions, Puritanism found at Cambridge a strong centre for disseminating Calvinistic opinions.

ii. The exertions of Archbishop Whitgift had secured in the Elizabethan statutes of the University a formidable preponderance of influence for the Heads of Colleges, and he and some other bishops were inclined to take part with the Heads, and espousing the popular side which was

inclined to predestinarian tenets, to condemn the late band of orthodox divines, who wished "to raise their scheme of divinity upon the noble foundations of the Fathers, the Councils, and the ecclesiastical historians[1]." In 1595 the archbishop, who was a strong disciplinarian and regarded conformity to the law, ecclesiastical and civil, as the first duty of an English subject, thought by assimilating the doctrines of the English Church to the doctrines of Calvin, who had become what the "Master of the Sentences" had been in the palmy days of the Scholastic philosophy, to reconcile the Puritan party, and render them innocuous to the Government. Accordingly he got together at Lambeth Palace Dr Fletcher, Bishop of London; Dr Vaughan, Bishop of Bangor, and Dr Tyndall, Dean of Ely, and the Calvinistic divines from Cambridge, and drew up what are called "The Lambeth Articles."

iii. These Articles were nine in number, and they laid down the following propositions:—

i. Deus ab æterno prædestinavit quosdam ad vitam, et quosdam ad mortem reprobavit.	i. God hath from eternity predestinated certain persons to life, and hath reprobated certain persons unto death.
ii. Causa movens aut efficiens prædestinationis ad vitam non est prævisio fidei aut perseverantiæ, aut bonorum operum, aut ullius rei quæ insit in personis prædestinatis, sed sola voluntas bene placiti Dei.	ii. The moving or efficient cause of predestination unto life is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the persons predestinated; but the alone will of God's good pleasure.
iii. Prædestinatorum præfinitus et certus est numerus, qui nec augeri nec minui potest.	iii. The predestinate are a predetermined and certain number, which can neither be lessened nor increased.
iv. Qui non sunt prædestinati ad salutem, necessario propter peccata sua damnabuntur.	iv. Such as are not predestinated to salvation shall inevitably be condemned on account of their sins.

[1] The expression of Young, Bishop of Rochester, in 1600, when he ordained the future Archbishop Laud. Le Bas, *Life of Laud*, p. 6, quoted in Hardwick's *Reformation*, p. 242.

v. Vera, viva et justificans fides, et spiritus Dei sanctificans non extinguitur, non excidit, non evanescit in electis, aut finaliter aut totaliter.	v. The true, lively, and justifying faith, and the Spirit of God sanctifying is not extinguished, doth not utterly fail, doth not vanish away in the elect, either finally or totally.
vi. Homo vere fidelis, id est, fide justificante præditus, certus est plerophoria fidei, de remissione peccatorum suorum et salute sempiterna sua per Christum.	vi. A true believer, that is, one who is endowed with justifying faith, is certified by the full assurance of faith that his sins are forgiven, and that he shall be everlastingly saved by Christ.
vii. Gratia salutaris non tribuitur, non communicatur universis hominibus, qua servari possint, si voluerint.	vii. Saving grace is not allowed, is not imparted, is not granted to all men, by which they may be saved if they will.
viii. Nemo potest venire ad Christum nisi datum ei fuerit, et nisi Pater eum traxerit. Et omnes homines non trahuntur a Patre ut veniant ad filium.	viii. No man is able to come to Christ, unless it be given him, and unless the Father draw him; and all men are not drawn by the Father, that they may come to His Son.
ix. Non est positum in arbitrio aut potestate uniuscujusque hominis servari.	ix. It is not in the will or power of every man to be saved.

iv. These Articles, asserting the extremest views of the Calvinistic system, were too pronounced for the Queen or statesmen like Burghley to accept, and were abhorrent to the rising school of theologians represented by Andrewes and Overall[1]. To Andrewes the statements contained in the first and last of the Articles seemed to be a direct incentive to lawlessness. "They were charging God with cruelty," said Burghley, "and might make men desperate in their wickedness." Moreover the prelates, who drew them up at Whitaker's suggestion acted without authority, for they were not assembled in synod. The meeting was a mere private conference, and the Articles had no synodical authority. Whitgift was severely censured afterwards by Elizabeth for the whole proceeding, and so,

[1] See Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans*, p. 51.

finding himself in opposition to the Court, he was content to let the matter drop[1], and promised to write to Cambridge that the Articles might be suppressed[2].

[1] See Strype, *Whitgift*, p. 462. For Hooker's view of the Lambeth Articles, see his *Works*, i. p. cii. *et passim*; Saravia's in Strype, *Whitgift*, Bk. iv. Append. xxiv.; Bishop Andrewes in his *Minor Works*, pp. 289—300, *Lib. Anglo-Cath. Theol.*

[2] They were, however, again brought forward and rejected at the Hampton Court Conference in 1604.

II.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

I.

Article ii, p. 45. Add to Note 2 the following words:

The phrase "ex illius substantia naturam humanam assumpsit" is an implicit denial of the Apollinarian heresy "ipsam Verbi naturam...esse discissam; quasi aliud ejus permaneret in Deo, aliud vero versum fuisset in carnem...ex una Christi Divinitate duas...factas esse substantias." S. Vincent. Lirin., Comm. xii. Comp. S. Epiphan. *Adv. Hær.*, lxxvii. (4).

II.

Article vi, p. 99, Note 2. Add:

Yet the Holy Orthodox Church is virtually in agreement with the Article. In her view all dogma in the technical sense of the term is *Veritas Revelata*, and in the words of one of her most distinguished Theologians, "en effet, il n'existe pas proprement aucun dogme ecclésiastique qui se puisse distinguer des dogmes bibliques; du moins, il n'en existe aucun de ce genre dans L'Église Orthodoxe." Macaire, *Theol. Dogm. Orth.*, i. 2 (21) F. T.

III.

Article vi, p. 103, Note 4. Add:

The Article does not assert that "Holy Scripture containeth *expressly* all things necessary to salvation." Indeed the phrase "may be proved thereby" contemplates *implicit* as distinct from *explicit* statements. The hermeneutical tradition which our Church accepts is accepted also by the Roman Church; "item Sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater Ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Sacrarum Scripturarum admitto; nec eam umquam, nisi juxta unanimem consensum Patrum accipiam et interpretabor." *Prof. Fid. Trid.* 3; *Decr. de Can. Script.*, Sess. iv.

IV.

Article x, p. 157. Add to Note 3 the following words:

S. Bernard, in his Treatise *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, explaining that Sin does not evacuate the Will of *Freedom*, distinguishes *Liberum Arbitrium* from *Liberum Consilium* and *Liberum Complacitum*, the two latter being (the one the lower and the other the higher) degrees of *Goodness* of Will vouchsafed in the state of Grace and in the state of Glory respectively. Freedom of Will simply expresses the causal relation of *character*, good or bad, to action; wherever there exists what we understand by character, there exists also Freedom of Will; but, and this is what S. Bernard means by his distincton, action *corresponds with* character, indeed it is essential to Freedom of Will that it should do so; for action *not* in correspondence with character would be not free and moral but compulsory and natural; Grace respects Freedom of Will *just because it is an*

influence upon character. Comp. Green, *Proleg. to Ethics*, p. 113, Ed. 1884; S. Bernard, *De Gratia et Libero Arbitrio*, Cap. 3, 4, and 5.

V.

Article xi. Add a Note to p. 162, on (ii) the *Source and History* of the Article, as follows:

Whatever may be said as to the *Lutheran* source of the Article, the phrase "propter meritum Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non propter opera et merita nostra" is quite evidently (even if, which is not *certain*, it was adapted from the Würtemberg Confession) not *solifidian;* for the question, thus stated, is one as between not merely, nor chiefly, *faith* and *works*, but *our* merits and *Christ's* merits; in other words, Justification is with the Article, as with Holy Scripture, Justification by Faith *and Grace.*

VI.

Article xi. Add to Note 3 on p. 166:

By Grace here is intended Grace *generally* (i.e. in the widest sense), of which (α) and (β) are, on the authority of Scripture, the highest *special* determinations.

VII.

Article xv, p. 196, Note 3. Add:

S. Augustine's remark is suggested by the fact that Pelagius includes the Blessed Virgin among those "qui juste vixisse referuntur." Pelagius speaks of her as "quam sine peccato confiteri necesse esse pietati." The context concerns *actual* sin only, but Roman theologians claim the statement as evidence for the Immaculate Conception. Comp. Gaume, *Catéchisme de Persévérance*, vii. p. 418. Paris, 1872.

VIII.

Article xv, p. 198. Add a Note to the word "sin" in line 14:

"Declarat tamen sanctus Synodus non esse suæ intentionis comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam, Dei Genitricem; sed observandas esse Constitutiones felicis recordationis Sixti Papæ IV." Sess. v. *Decr. de Pecc. Originali.*

IX.

Article xv, p. 198. Add a Note to the word "Bull" in line 17:

Comp. *Decr. Pii IX de Immac. Concept. B. Virg. Mariæ* from the Bull "Ineffabilis Deus." "Doctrinam, quae tenet, beatissimam Virginem Mariam in primo instanti suæ Conceptionis fuisse singulari Omnipotentis Dei gratiæ privilegio, intuitu meritorum Christi Jesu Salvatoris humani generis, ab omni originalis culpæ labe præservatam immunem, esse a Deo revelatam, atque idcirco ab omnibus fidelibus firmiter constanterque credendam."

(1) According to this view, so we must in fairness admit, the Immaculate Conception is not regarded as effected apart from the Merits of our Lord, the Saviour of Mankind;

(2) Taking, as Roman theologians do, Conception to be the union with the Body of the *already existent* Rational Soul, the Immaculate Conception would imply that the soul of S. Mary, *created without Original Righteousness* and so *in Original Sin*, was the recipient at Conception of a

quite unique "emundatio a peccato originali", a kind of pre-natal Baptism. Comp. Gaume, *Catéchisme de Persévérance*, vii. pp. 416 sqq., Paris, 1872, and the authorities quoted *in loc.*

X.

Article xxv, p. 297:

Sacramentum. The observations of the present Bishop of Salisbury on the etymology of this word are deserving of attention. "The origin of the term *Sacramentum*," he says, "is generally explained on the authority of Varro, from the sacred place (*ad pontem*) where it was deposited *pendente lite.* '*Sacramentum* a sacro... ad pontem (sometimes corrected, but needlessly, *ad pontificem*) deponebant ...Qui judicio vicerat, suum sacramentum e sacro auferebat, victi ad ærarium redibat.' *L. L.* v. 180. But it would seem much more in harmony with the other uses of the word and its cognates, to explain it in its original meaning, as an oath calling down the wrath of heaven if the swearer was perjured. Cp. Festus, pp. 344, 345, M., 'sacramento dicitur quod (jurisjurandi sacrati)one interposita actum (est; unde quis sacramen)to dicitur interrogari...' The oath of the justice of the cause defended, and the religious penalty it involved (perhaps loss of civil rights, cp. *sacer esto*), must in process of time have been commuted for a payment in kind, or money, at a fixed rate. And though the oath seems to have continued, it naturally got to be regarded as less important than the deposit of money which accompanied it, so that the latter acquired, in time, the name of *Sacramentum* exclusively, and was variously explained by Varro, and, once at least, by Verrius Flaccus (the original of Festus), as derived from some connection of place or usage with religion. Modern writers have universally followed them...and this is remarkable, seeing that the metaphors taken from the process *justo*, or *injusto sacramento contendere*, etc. (Cic. *de Or.* i. 42, *pro Mil.* 75, *pro Domo*, 78, *pro Cæcina*, 97), seem necessarily to imply the assertion of the *rightfulness* of a cause, such as in old times must have taken the form of an oath. The taxation of the *Sacramentum* at so many asses was, no doubt, the work of the decemvirs, who seem rightly to be credited with the introduction of coined money." *Fragments and Specimens of Early Latin*, p. 516 by John Wordsworth. Oxford, 1874.

XI.

Article xxviii, p. 343:

Transubstantiation. If ever there lived a man most tenderly conscientious, it was Bernard Gilpin, "the Apostle of the North." While he was at the palace of his uncle, Cuthbert Tunstal of Durham, early in Mary's reign, that Bishop's Chaplains, staunch Romans, knowing of Gilpin's efforts at Reform, and wishful to entangle him, began to ply him concerning the Presence. Bernard answered that he had no strong argument wherewith in his judgment he might oppose the Real Presence, for "I suppose," said he, "that therein lieth hid a great mystery, such a one as is above my capacity; rather to be adored than disputed upon." The Chaplains then asked what he thought of Transubstantiation. He replied "that there was no necessity why we should believe those things which have no solid ground in the Word of God."

The night was cold, and the aged prelate sat in his chair before the fire. Conversation was in an undertone, for they thought him asleep. But the Bishop had heard it all. Opening his eyes, he looked over his chair, and said, "Father's soul, let him alone, for he hath more learning than you all." Dr Chr. Wordsworth, *Eccl. Biog.* vol. iv, p. 104 sqq., Ed. 1818.

XII.

Article xxix. p. 347. Add a Note to the word "hurt" in line 12:

The compilers of the Articles were not ignorant, indeed had ample evidence in the practice of various sectaries of their day, of the law of reaction, in accordance with which an excessive infrequency of Communion would readily tend to replace itself by an equally excessive and equally perilous frequency. The insistence of Article xxv. upon the due use of the Sacraments *generally* is here applied *specially* to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, with the added warning that *due* use is no mere synonym for *frequent* use.

XIII.

Article xxix. p. 348, Note 3. Add:

The words in italics in S. Aug. *Tract. in S. Joann.* xxvi. § 18 were rejected by the Benedictine Editors on the ground of lack of MSS. evidence for them. But supposing they are genuine, they are far from expressing Virtualist doctrine. The unworthy recipient is described as one "qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus," and it is said of him that "procul dubio nec manducat (*spiritualiter*) carnem Ejus, nec bibit Ejus sanguinem." On the other hand, to receive worthily is "in Christo manere," and "manducare illam Escam (i.e. carnem Meam)." A reference to § 15 *ad fin.* of the Tractate shows "manducare" to be equivalent to "particeps esse." Thus the unworthy recipient is *not*, the worthy recipient *is* "particeps" of the Body of Christ. To say, however, that the unworthy recipient is not "particeps" of the Res Sacramenti is not to say that the Res Sacramenti is not "taken," even "taken and eaten," in such a case. In the Church Catechism it is stated that the Body and Blood of Christ "are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Here "received" is more than "taken," just as in the words of administration "feed upon Him" is more than "take and eat This." So here "manducare" and "particeps esse" are more than "sumere," and, as if to make it evident that "manducare" has here the fuller meaning of so receiving the Res as also to receive the Virtus, the word "spirituaaliter" is added pleonastically, and therefore emphatically, as though S. Augustine would urge, "when I say 'nec manducat' I mean that the unworthy recipient 'non manet in Christo,' that he does not feed upon Christ to his profit, 'non manducat spiritualiter.'" But there is something upon which he does feed, alas! to no profit, something which "ad judicium sibi manducat." What is that? It is "tantæ *Rei* Sacramentum" not "tantæ Virtutis Sacramentum." That which he "premit dentibus" is no mere Sacramentum of an absent Virtus, but the very "Sacramentum Corporis et Sanguinis Christi," which agrees with the words of S. Augustine elsewhere, when he says of unworthy recipients "ipsi quippe adducti sunt ad mensam Christi, et accipiunt de Corpore et Sanguine Ejus; sed adorant tantum, non etiam saturantur, quoniam non imitantur." How else are we to distinguish here "accipere" from "saturari," if not as marking the difference between "receiving the Res Sacramenti" from "receiving the Virtus Sacramenti"? Comp. S. Aug. *De Grat. Nov. Test. Lib. seu Ep. cxl.* 27 (66). Ed. Migne 1845, tom. xxxiii. p. 566.

XIV.

Article xxxi. p. 358. Note:

i. It is to be carefully kept in mind that the Article is primarily concerned with the "Unica Christi oblatio in Cruce perfecta." This is elaborately

and distinctly drawn out in the first clause: "Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus." Here we notice (1) the number of words used to set forth the completeness and all-sufficiency of our Lord's sacrifice of Himself once made on the Altar of His Cross; (2) the reiteration of the language of the Second Article, as to the completeness of that Sacrifice "for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." This strong assertion of the sufficiency of our Lord's sacrifice no less for actual than for original sin, occurring twice in the xxxix. Articles, plainly indicates some error popularly entertained, which it was very necessary to refute, as implying an ignorance on the part of many men "of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ[1]." This error, as the language of Latimer[2] and Gardiner[3] attest for England, and the Augsburg Confession for the Continent[4], was the view that for sins committed before Baptism and for original sin, men must look to the sacrifice of the Cross, but for actual sins committed after Baptism, to the Sacrifice of the Mass, which is *therefore* to be daily repeated and reiterated. This opinion may or may not have been held by Albertus Magnus and Catharinus[5], but that it was a common popular error in the middle of the Sixteenth Century cannot be denied, and accounts for the fact that the Article insists for the second time on what had already been asserted in Article ii., that our Lord on the Cross made satisfaction for all sins "tam originalibus quam actualibus[6]."

ii. Now where had the error received the most marked expression? What brought it most prominently before the notice of ordinary people? What more clearly than the system of private Masses which the Chantries Act of 1547 was passed in order to put down? Here we see the sequence of the second sentence of the Article, and the force of the word "unde" indicating that the statement is a corollary from the main subject of the Article; and the words "quibus vulgo dicebatur" make it clear that the corollary is not dogmatic but historical, the plural "missarum sacrificia" being not the generic term expressive of any formulated tenet, but the graphic description of what was at the time taking place, here, and there and elsewhere, any and every day. It is true that we must not press too far the use of the plural "missarum" instead of "missæ." "But why the plural 'sacrificia'? and why 'sacrifices of Masses' in the English[7]? May not these plurals point to the iteration of sacrifices professing, each after each, to be an actual and virtually independent propitiation? While, therefore, the language of the Article seems to condemn an error which was as incidental to the public as to the private Masses, its history would suggest that this protest arose in connection with the private Masses, the latest, the most popular, and the most emphatic embodiment of that view of the Mass as propitiatory which is what really conflicts with the principle

[1] See the Chantries Act of 1547 (1 Ed. VI. c. 14), which preceded the Article by five years.
[2] See above, p. 367, note 1.
[3] See above, p. 368, note 2.
[4] See above, p. 367, note 1.
[5] Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury holds that this treatise of Catharinus, *De Veritate incruenti Sacrificii novi et æterni Testamenti*, can hardly have been known to the Compilers of the Articles. But he adds, "opiniones Catharini et similium doctorum satis notæ erant, vel per se, vel per alios, qui similia apud nos profitebantur." *Responsio ad Batavos*, p. 23.
[6] That the error was actually taught is shewn by Dr Vacant, *Histoire de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe*, p. 40, n. 3. Paris, 1894.
[7] See Article in *Church Quarterly Review* on "Anglican Orders," April, 1896.

laid down in the first clause of the Article[1]."

iii. That the Article is primarily directed against private Masses seems clear, but it is not meant to deny that it is even more comprehensive and touches the idea, then popular, that the Mass itself is a *real propitiatory Sacrifice valid independently of the Sacrifice of the Cross*. Associated with this was the error that the Mass was a work which, being done by the Priest, merited remission, "idque ex opere operato," because of the actual performance and apart from any good intention of the doer, and that it procured remission of the pains of Purgatory of its own intrinsic value and independently of human moral effort[2]. "The popular belief of later times," writes Professor Mozley, "exaggerated the Eucharistic Sacrifice till it became, to all intents and purposes, a real one, and 'the priest offered up Christ on the Altar for quick and dead, to have remission of pain and guilt'; that is to say, offered Him up as a Victim, in a sense which could not be distinguished from that in which He was offered up by Himself on the Cross. It is true that the decree of the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii. c. 2) just saves itself by cautious not to say dissembling language from the extreme and monstrous conclusion that the sacrifice of the Mass is the very same with that upon the Cross...but at the same time it asserts that the sacrifice of the Mass is a really *propitiatory sacrifice—vere propitiatorium*. Now undoubtedly there are two senses in which an act may be said to be propitiatory. The act of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross had an original propitiatory power; that is to say, it was the cause of any other act, or any act of man, or any rite being propitiatory, that is, appeasing God's anger, and reconciling Him to the agent. We may allow that in common language a man may do something which will reconcile God to him, and restore him to God's favour; but then all the power that any action of man can have for this end is a derived power, derived from Christ's sacrifice, from which any other sacrifice, the Eucharistic one included, borrows its virtue, and without which it would be wholly null and void. There is, then, an original propitiation and a borrowed propitiation, a first propitiation and a secondary one. Why then did the Fathers of Trent, when they had all human language at their command, deliberately choose to call the sacrifice of the Mass, *vere propitiatorium*? They may have said that it was *vere propitiatorium* in the secondary sense; but no one can fail to see the misleading effects of such language, and that nothing would have been easier to the Divines of Trent, had they chosen, than to draw a far more clear distinction than they did between the sacrifice of the Mass and the sacrifice on the Cross. It is evident that, as ecclesiastical statesmen, they were afraid of interfering with the broad popular established view of the Mass, while, as theologians, they just contrived to secure themselves from the responsibility of a monstrous dogmatic statement." Mozley, *Lectures*, pp. 216, 217. London, 1883.

XV.

Article xxxi, p. 367. Note:

The position taken up in the Article is well illustrated by a work of Bishop

[1] The original of the Article goes back, as we have seen above, pp. 360, n. 3, and 367, n. 2, to the Augsburg Confession. Compare a draft Article of Cranmer's "de Missa Privata," where he says "Eucharistia a solo sumitur sacerdote, qui illam in turpissimum quæstum pro vivis et defunctis applicat." Jenkyns, *Cranmer's Remains*, iv. 294.

[2] It is just to say that the Council of Trent, Sess. xxii. c. 2, insists upon the condition "si cum vero corde et recta fide, cum metu et reverentia, contriti et pœnitentes ad Deum accedamus."

Guest's, entitled *A Treatise againste the prevee masse in the behalfe and furtherauance of the moost holye communyon made by Edmund Gest.* MDXLVIII. It is reprinted in Appendix i. of Dugdale's *Life and Character of Edmund Geste*, Ed. 1840. The following passages are quite evidently condemnatory of no authoritative Roman teaching, but of *vulgo dicta* such as is that contemplated by the Article, "Howe can it possible be that Christes bodye which cannot be mayde holyer and perfecter than already it is, shuld or myght be consecrat of the priest...ther is no creature, be it neuer so imperfyte that is ofte made, howe than can Christes bodye be ofte made, that is the most perfyte." pp. 77, 78. In this connection Bishop Guest condemns also the *vulgo dictum*, mentioned by the Bishop of Salisbury, *Responsio ad Batavos*, p. 11, Ed. 1895, that the Priest in the Mass *creates* Christ; compare *Stella Clericorum*, folio B. ii. 2, Ed. 1498, "Iste qui creavit me, dedit mihi creare se: qui creavit me sine me, creatur mediante me." Again, we read in the Treatise in question, "Paul sayth not wyth a manyfold or renewed but with one offering hath Christe made perfecte for ever the sanctified. In consyderacion whereof they bee foule deceaved who avouche Christes sacrifice ought to be revived and multiplied to the ful pardon and contentacion of our synne otherwyse unpardonable, and therefore repete the sayd sacryfyce day by day to the same effect." pp. 87, 88. "For syth at the prevy masse ther is none to suppli ye roumth and office of Christe in ministering the supper it cannot be the Lordes but ye priestes supper.... But some wot saye the priest may supplye the person both of the institour exhybitour and receyver of thee masse supper, therfor it is the Lordes. Yf thys that is objected were true, then mought one baptysme hymselve, assolye hymselve.....annoynte hymselve." pp. 121, 122. "He had us sever the consecrate breade charitablye among us and not eche of us to reserve it to hymselve, and to eate uncharytablye al alone as the prest dothe." p. 124. This is the type of abuse in teaching and in practice contemplated by the Compilers; Bishop Guest has here in view quite definitely "the prevee masse," and the main conclusion of his Treatise is couched in words that almost remind one of the Article, "Thus it is plane that ye private masse supper is to be discontynued and surcesed as blasphemous to God and annoyous to the practycioners therof, and the devocyon and holyness, that is supposed to be in the usage thereof is mere ydolatrye and superstycion, and so both dampnable and exchevable." The strength of the language is to be measured by the fact that, as matters stood at the time, abuses no more essential to the Sacrifice of the Mass than was the sin of the Corinthians who discerned not the Lord's Body, were intimately associated with the *Private* Mass.

XVI.

Article xxxvii, p. 420. Add to the end of § xi the following Note:

The question at issue between England and Rome is not so much that of the *Primacy* of the Bishop of Rome, as the question whether or not that Primacy involves Universal Jurisdiction in the sense that the *potestas* of the Episcopate is everywhere derived not from the See over which a Bishop presides, but from the Pope as the Universal *Pastor Ordinarius*. This claim to be the Ordinary of every Christian it was which constituted the abuse so indignantly resented in England not only at the Reformation, but from time to time during the preceding centuries.

III.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

England.	The Continent.
	1516 Erasmus publishes the Greek Testament, with a Latin translation.
	1517 Luther nails up his ninety-five Theses at Wittemberg.
	1520 Luther appeals to a General Council.
	1521 Edict of Worms.
	1522 Luther publishes his German translation of the New Testament.
	1529 Conference of Luther and Zwingli at Marburg.
	Publication of the Schwabach Articles.
1530 An Act of Parliament forbids application to Rome for Dispensation from English Laws.	1530 June 25, Diet of Augsburg.
	June 30, Confession of Augsburg drawn up by Melancthon.
	Aug. 3, Refutation of the Confession read.
1531 All money payments claimed by the Roman See forbidden.	
1533 All appeals to Rome from the English Courts forbidden.	
Cranmer pronounces the divorce between Henry VIII. and Catherine.	
Revision of the Sarum Missal.	
1534 Convocation requests the authorisation of an English Bible.	
The Papal Supremacy rejected by the English Church.	
1535 Second Edition of Marshall's Primer.	
Coverdale's Bible.	
1536 Publication of the Ten Articles.	1536 First Helvetic Confession.
	Publication of Calvin's *Institutes*.
1537 Publication of the "Institution of a Christian Man" or "The Bishops' Book."	1537 Articles of Smalkald.
Publication of Matthew's Bible.	
Culminating point of the Reformation under Henry VIII.	

England.	The Continent.
1538 The Thirteen Articles published. Excommunication of Henry VIII. and England.	
1539 Publication of the Six Articles. The "Great" or Cranmer's Bible.	
	1540 The order of the Jesuits constituted by the Pope.
1542 Use of Sarum ordered to be observed in the Province of Canterbury. The reading of the New Testament forbidden to all below a certain rank.	1542 May 22, Council of Trent summoned.
1543 Publication of "A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man" or "The King's Book."	1543 July 6, The Council prorogued.
1544 Litany in English.	
1545 King Henry's Primer.	1545 Diet of Worms. Dec. 13, Opening of Council of Trent. Discussion of order of proceedings.
	1546 Death of Luther. Feb. 4, Decree concerning the Nicene Creed. April 8, Decree concerning the Canon of Holy Scripture. July 17, Decree concerning original Sin.
1547 Death of Henry VIII. Accession of Edward VI. Publication of The First Book of Homilies.	1547 Jan. 13, Decree concerning Justification. March 3, Decree concerning the Sacraments.
1548 The Order of the Holy Communion published. Cranmer's Catechism.	1548 Council of Trent suspended.
1549 First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.	
1550 Publication of the English Ordinal.	
1551 Revision of the Prayer-Book.	1551 Oct. 11, Decree of Trent respecting the Eucharist. Nov. 25, Decree concerning Penance and Extreme Unction.
1552 The Forty-five Articles. Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.	1552 The Würtemberg Confession. Jan. 25, Hearing at Trent of the envoys from Würtemberg. April 28, War in Germany, suspension of the Council. Publication of Calvin's book *De Prædestinatione.*
1553 The Forty-two Articles. Poynet's Catechism.	

England.	The Continent.
1553 Death of Edward VI. Accession of Mary.	
1558 Accession of Elizabeth.	
1559 Publication of the Eleven Articles.	
	1561 The Pope invites the Queen and the English Bishops to the Council[1].
	1562 Jan. 18, Re-assembly of Council of Trent.
	July 16, Decree concerning Communion under both species, and the Communion of Infants.
1562 Jewel's Apology.	
	Sept. 17, Decree concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass.
1563 Nowell's Catechism.	1563 July 15, Decree concerning the Sacrament of Orders.
Publication of the XXXIX Articles.	
Publication of the Second Book of Homilies.	Nov. 11, Decree concerning Marriage.
	Dec. 3, 4, Decrees concerning Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, Veneration of Relics and Sacred Images, and Indulgences.
	1564 Pius IV. sends the Acts of the Council to Mary Queen of Scots, requesting her to publish them in Scotland.
	1566 Catechism of the Council of Trent.
	1570 Issue of Pius Vth's Bull deposing Queen Elizabeth.
1571 The XXXIX Articles revised in Convocation.	
The English Edition revised by Bp Jewel.	
The Ratification.	

[1] F. Paolo Sarpi, *Historia del Concil. Trident.*, p. 423, ed. 1619. As regards this invitation Froude quotes Cecil's answer—"If the Council was held in a place which the Kings of France and Spain considered satisfactory the Queen of England, Cecil said, could not reasonably object; she would not refuse to allow the presidency of the Pope, provided it was understood that the Pope was not above the Council but merely its head; and its decisions should be accepted in England if they were in harmony with Holy Scripture and the first four General Councils. But he assumed—as if it was a point on which no difficulty could be raised—that the English Bishops, having been apostolically ordained, and not merely elected by a congregation like Lutherans or Calvinists, would be admitted to sit with the rest." Froude, *Hist. of England*, p. 482. London, 1870.

IV.

GENERAL INDEX.

Absolution, words of in the Ordinal, Article xxxvi. Objected to by the Puritans, 404; defence of, 405

Anglican Orders, Article xxxvi. Validity of defended against objections, 398; (1) on the ground of the invalidity of Parker's consecration and Barlow's, 398, 399; (2) the form and matter of the consecration, 400, 401; (3) the words employed, 401, 402; (4) no power of sacrifice conferred, 402, 403

Apocrypha, Article vi. Derivation of word, 112; gradual formation of Apocryphal Books, 112; use of promoted by Septuagint Version, 112; and the Vulgate, 113; judgment of English Church respecting, 113, 114

Articles, origin of, 1; need of, 1; the danger they aimed at averting, 4; the Schwabach Articles, 6; their relation to the Augsburg Confession, 6, 7; importance of this Confession, 8; the Ten Articles, 10; their features, 11; the Thirteen Articles, 12; the Six Articles, 13; compilation of the Forty-two Articles, 15, 16; their contents, 16; additions as compared with the Thirty-Nine, 16, 17; omissions, 16; the Eleven Articles, 18; revision of the Forty-two Articles, 19; its effect, 19; the changes made, 19; adopted by Convocation, 20; the Queen's Ratification, 20, 21; revision of 1571, 21, 22; ratification analysed, 22 *n.*

Ascension of Christ, Article iv. Scripture doctrine respecting, 82; how related in the Gospels, 82 *n.*; evidential value of this, 82 *n.*; importance of the doctrine insisted on in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 82; and by S. John, 83

Authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith, Article vi, 99; of the Church, Art. xx, as regards (1) rites or ceremonies, 248—250; (2) controversies of faith, 250; (3) as a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, 251, 252

Baptism Holy, Article xxvii. Source of Article, 315; object, 316; analysis, 316, 317; alteration of clause respecting Infant Baptism, 317; use of water for ceremonial purification amongst (*a*) the Gentiles, 318, (*b*) the Jews, 318; the baptism of proselytes, 318, 319; the baptism of John, 319; the baptism of our Lord, 319, 320; Apostolic baptism, 320; the grace of holy baptism, 321; baptismal regeneration, 323; infant baptism defended by (1) the analogy of the Jewish Covenant, 325; (2) the teaching of our Lord, 325, 326; (3) Apostolic custom, 326; (4) the practice of the primitive Church, 327; conclusion, 338

Both kinds, reception in, Article xxx. Object of Article, 352; analysis of, 353; comparison of account of the Original Institution, 353; Apostolic custom, 354; Patristic testimony, 355; origin of practice of communicating in one kind only, 356; conclusion, 357

Canon, the, Article vi. Origin of word "Canon," 106; Canon of the Old Testament, 107; Hebrew Canon, 108; Canon of the New Testament, 109; testimony of Eusebius respecting, 111, 112
Ceremonies, authority of Church to decree, Article xx, 249, 250. *See* Church
Chastity, obligation of vows of, 13
Church, the, Article xix. Connection of Article, 236; source of, 237; origin of the word Church, 237, 238; the visible and invisible Church, 238; the Church as a visible society, 240; marks of the Church: first mark, 241, 242; second mark, 242; claim of Roman Church to inerrancy, 243, 244; how refuted in the Article, 244, 245
Clerical Celibacy, Article xxxii. Position of Article, 371; change of wording of Article, 371; importance of, why attached to clerical celibacy, 371; early history of, 372; later developments, 373; increasing rigidness of rule in the West, 373; enforced at Synods of Winchester and London, 373, 374; teaching of Scripture respecting, in Old Testament, 374; and New, 374, 375; passages of Scripture which seem to give the preference to single life, 375, 376; conclusion, 376
Communion in Both Kinds. *See* Both Kinds, 352—357
Consecration of Bishops and Ministers, Article xxxvi. Alteration of Title of Article, 396; publication of the Anglican Ordinal, 397; object of Article, 397; objections to Anglican Ordinal, 397; (*a*) (1) objections of mediævalists' insufficient evidence of Parker's consecration, 398, 399; (2) the lack of certain essential ceremonies, 400; (3) absence of sufficient formulæ, 401; (4) lack of conferring power to offer sacrifice, 402; (*b*) objections of the Puritans to (1) the Ordination formula, 404; (2) the claim to exercise the ministry of reconciliation, 405
Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Article xx. Parker MSS in Library of, 247
Corpus Christi, Festival of, Article xxviii. When introduced, 345; no part of the original institution of the Eucharist, 345
Councils, Article xxi. Title of Article and language, 255; object and analysis, 256; New Testament precedent for Church Councils, 256; Diocesan and Provincial Councils, 256, 257; the first Œcumenical Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, Ephesus, Chalcedon, 260; power of the Emperor to summon General Councils, 258; this power claimed by the Pope, 258, 259; "Councils may err," meaning of expression, 259; relation of Councils to Holy Scripture, 260; binding force of Conciliar Decrees, 260, 261 *n.*
Creeds, Article viii. Origin of, 133; gradual formation, 134; Eastern and Western Creeds, 134; Nicene Creed, its antiquity, 134; origin of, 134; constant repetition of, 134; Athanasian Creed, its authorship, 135; a Canticle or Creed Hymn, 135; its structure, 135, 136; Apostles' Creed, gradual growth of, 136; meaning of the name, 137; ground of reception, 137, 138

Delivery of the Instruments, Article xxxvi. Meaning of, 400; date of the ceremony, 400; not essential to valid Ordination, 401
Descent into Hell, Article iii. Connection of Article, 60; Language and History, 60; object of Article, 61; not found in the earliest Creeds, 61, 62; meaning of word Hell, 62 *n.*; what it is not, 62; what it is, 62; other words with which it is not to be confounded, 62; the fact of the Descent proved from Scripture, 63; practical lessons deducible from, 64; doctrinal importance of Article, 64, 65; issues of the Descent, 65, 66
Diary, Archbishop Parker's, 400 *n.*
Döllinger, Dr, on Parker's consecration, 400

Election, Article xvii. View of in the Old Testament, 219, 220; Election in the New Testament, 220, 221
Eucharistic Sacrifice, Article xxxi. Mediæval corruptions of the doctrine of, 367, 368
Excommunication, Article xxxiii. Source of Article, 377; object, 377; analysis, 377, 378; Jewish Excommunication, 378; teaching of our Lord, 378; Apostolic practice, 379; Christian Excommunication, 379, 380; Excommunication in the Middle Ages, 380; teaching of Reformers respecting, 380; form of, contemplated in the Article, 380, 381
Extreme Unction, Article xxv. Unction with oil for medicinal purposes in the Old Testament, 305*n.*; in the New, 305*n.*; view of the Article concerning, 306 and *n.*

Faith and Works, Article xii. Relation of, 176, 177
Faith, relation of to Justification, Article xi, 166, 167
Final Perseverance, Article xvi. By whom taught, 209; objections to doctrine, 208; angels not incapable of falling, 209; teaching of our Lord respecting, 209, 210; teaching of S. Paul and S. Peter, 210; doctrine of the Prayer-Book on the subject, 210, 211; true doctrine, 211*n.*
Free Will, Article x. Peculiarity of title of Article, 155; object of Article, 156; analysis, 156; the problem of Free Will, 157; crippling of the will by sin, 157; the Gospel remedy for, 157—159

God, Article i. Source and object of Article, 24, 25; the existence of God, 25; lines of evidence in proof of, 25—39; summary of the argument, 31; the unity of God, 32; Scripture proofs, 32, 33; the attributes of God, 33—38
Goods, Community of, Article xxxviii. Connection of Article, 423; analysis, 424; teaching of Scripture, 424; the right of property, 425
Grace, Article x. The Latin and Greek equivalents, 157; meaning of the word, 157, 158; prevenient Grace, 158; cooperating Grace, 159; teaching of the early Fathers respecting Grace, 160, 161; teaching of the Prayer-Book respecting Grace, 161
Guest, Bishop, his connection with Article xxviii, 343

Hades, Article iii. Meaning of, 62; our Lord's descent into, 63; its practical lessons, 64; its issues, 65
Hell. *See* Descent into Hell, p. 63
Holy Ghost, of the, Article v. Connection of the Article, 87; source and object, 87, 88; analysis, 88; characteristic of the Holy Ghost, 88; His procession from the Father, 88, 89; His procession from the Son, 89, 90; His procession from the Father and the Son, 90, 91; His consubstantiality with the Father and the Son, 91, 92; His true Deity, 92, 93
Homilies, Article xxxv. Title of Article, 391; meaning and derivation of word "Homily," 391 and *note*; preaching in the early Church, 391 and *note*; decline of at period of Reformation, 392; First Book of Homilies, 392; authors of some of the Homilies, 392, 393; reception of the First Book, 393; Second Book ascribed to Bp Jewel, 393; objections of the Puritans to the Homilies, 394; the assent required by the Article, 394, 395

Images, Adoration of, Article xxii. Feeling about images in the early Church, 272; the Iconoclastic Controversy, 272; development of image-worship in Middle Ages, 272, 273; warnings against image-worship in the Old Testament, 274
Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, Article xv. Development of the doctrine, 196; silence during the first four centuries, 196; scruple expressed by S. Augustine, 196; development of doctrine during Middle Ages, 197; opinion of Bern-

ard of Clairvaux, 197; different views of the Dominicans and Franciscans, 197, 198; compromise at Council of Trent, 198; Bull of Pope Pius IX., 198; teaching of the Church of England, 198, 199
Incarnation of the Son of God, Article ii. Connection of Article, 44; title, source, and object, 45; the Deity of the Son of God, 46; the Word of the Father, 46, 47; begotten eternally of the Father, 47; very and eternal God, 48, 49; consubstantial with the Father, 49, 50; His Incarnation, 50; foreshadowings of it, 51; fulfilment, 51, 52; the union of the two natures, 52, 53
Intention, Doctrine of, Article xxvi. Defined, 313; remarks of Hooker on, 313; and Bp Jewel, 314; dictum of S. Thomas Aquinas, 314
Invocation of Saints, Article xxii. Prayers for the dead, 275; origin of practice, 275; development in the Middle Ages, 276; decision of Council of Trent respecting, 276; teaching of Scripture, 277; opinion of Launcelot Andrewes, 278

Jewel, Bishop, on doctrine of "Intention," 314
Jurisdiction, Papal, over England, question of, Article xxvii, 410, 411
Justification, Article xi. Connection of Article, 162; source and history, 162, 163; object, 163; analysis, 163; derivation of the word Justification, 163, 164; the moving cause of, 164; the meritorious cause, 165; the efficient cause, 165, 166; the instrumental cause, 166; province of faith in respect to Justification, 167; the office of faith, 167, 168; patristic teaching as regards Justification, 168, 169; conclusion, 169, 170

Lambeth Articles, 430—433
Lingard on Parker's consecration, 400 *note*
Lord's Supper, Sacrament of the, Article xxviii. Form and Language of Article. 330; object, 330; account of the institution, 331, 332; no mere sign, 334; a Sacrament of our Redemption, 334, 335; the inward grace of the Sacrament, 335, 336; its relation to the ancient sacrificial feasts, 336, 337

Marriage of Priests, Article xxxii. Connection of Article, 371; title and language, 371, 372; question of celibacy of Clergy, 372; not enjoined in early times of the Church, 372; gradual growth of esteem for celibacy, 373; proposed enforcement of clerical celibacy at Nicæa, 373; its rejection, 373; gradual extension in the West, 373; laid down for the English Clergy, 373, 374; not enjoined under the Jewish dispensation, 374; nor in the New Testament, 375; special passages, 375, 376; opinion of the Articles respecting, 376; conclusion, 376
Ministering in the Congregation, Article xxiii. Working of Article, 280; object, 280; principle of order in the Old Testament, 280; in the New Testament, 281, 282; the three orders during our Lord's life on earth, 282; in Apostolic times, 282; in the Sub-Apostolic Church, 283—285; view of the English Church, 286, 287

Oaths of a Christian, Article xxxix. Scruples of early Christians respecting, 426, 427; swearing as condemned by our Lord, 428; by S. James, 428; justification of oaths in a court of justice, 428; example of our Lord, 428; practice of S. Paul, 429; the conditions requisite for a legitimate oath, 429; quotation respecting, from Jeremiah, 429
Old Testament, the, Article vii. Connection with the New denied by early heretics, 115; and the Anabaptists, 115; object of Article respecting, 116; analysis of Article, 116; testimony of the Scriptures concerning, 117—122; testimony of the early fathers, 123; proof that the old fathers did not look only for transitory promises from

(1) the language of our Lord, 124, 125; (2) that of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 125, 126; (3) from the Old Testament itself, 127—129; the Mosaic law, its triple division, 129; the ceremonial law, 129; civil law, 130; the moral law of permanent obligation, 130, 131

One oblation of Christ upon the Cross, Article xxxi. Uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice, 360; title and connection of Article, 358; object and analysis, 359, 360; the perfect redemption, 360, 361; the perfect propitiation, 362, 363; the perfect satisfaction, 363, 364; for all the sins of the whole world, 364, 365; its completeness, 364; incapable of repetition, 365; relation of masses to, 366; efficacious for actual as well as original sin, 367; conclusion, 368, 369

Orders, Anglican, matter and form of, Article xxxvi. Objections to, 400, 401

Orders in the English Church, Article xxiii. *See* Ministering in the Congregation, 280—287

Ordinal, *see* Consecration of Bishops and Ministers, Article xxxvi.

Papal Supremacy in England, Article xxxvii. Grounds on which claimed, 410, 411; their refutation, 418—420

Pardons, Article xxii. Latin term for, 269; original meaning, 269; by whom originally granted, 269; extension of, 269; sale of by Tetzel, 269, 270; origin of the doctrine concerning, 270; teaching of Scripture respecting, 270, 271

Parker, Archbishop, Article xxxvi. Consecration of, 398; date of, 398; diary of, 400 *note*; proof of his consecration, 398, 399

Passion of our Lord, the, Article ii. Statements of Articles compared with the Creeds, 54; reality of the Passion, 54, 55; proofs of from Scripture, 55; from Tacitus, 56; object of the Passion, 56; to effect a reconciliation, 56, 57; to offer a sacrifice for all sins, original and actual, 58, 59

Peter, S., supremacy of, Article xxxvii. Grounds on which claimed, 411; examination of them, 412; position of S. Peter in the Gospels, 412; in the Acts, 413; in the Epistles, 413, 414; his true priority, 411 *n.*; in what sense the Church built upon, 411 *n.*; question of his bishopric at Rome, 414; his relation to S. Paul, 415; his martyrdom, 416

Predestination, Article xvii. Connection of Article xvii with preceding Article, 213; object of Article, 213, 214; origin of difficulties concerning, 214; view of S. Augustine, 214, 215; teaching of mediæval divines, 215, 216; views of Calvin, 217; of Arminius, 217, 218; teaching of the primitive fathers respecting, 218, 219; election and predestination in the Old Testament, 219, 220; in the New, 220, 221; teaching of the Article respecting, 221—225; ignores doctrine of reprobation, 225; lays down two canons of interpretation of Scripture respecting the doctrine of predestination, 226—228

Punishment, Capital, Article xxxvii. Objections to, 420; commanded in Old Testament, 421; not repealed in New, 421

Purgatory, Article xxii. Title and contents of Article, 262, 263; object and analysis, 263, 264; origin of doctrine, 264; at first a probability, 265; developed by (1) Gregory the Great, 265; (2) by legends and dreams, 265; (3) by poets, 266; teaching of Scripture respecting, 267, 268

Regeneration, Article xxvii. Origin of term, 323; classical usage of word, 323 *n.*; use in the New Testament, 323; meaning of explained, 323, 324

Register, Warham's, 399; Gardiner's, 399; Parker's, 399 *note*

Relics, Article xxii. Growth of reverence for, 273; development in Middle Ages, 274; Scripture teach-

ing respecting in Old Testament, 275; in New Testament, 275
Reservation of Blessed Sacrament, Article xxviii. Meaning of term, 344; growth of practice in Middle Ages, 344 *n.*; how far defensible, 345
Resurrection, the, of Christ, Article iv. Early heresies respecting, 70; non-Christian explanations of, 72—75; refutation of these explanations, 75, 76; refutation of theory of visions, 76; the Resurrection Body of Christ, 79; followed by the Ascension, 82, 83
Rites, power of Church to decree, Article xx. Denied by the Puritans, 247; controversy concerning clause, 246, 247; justified from the analogy of the Jewish Church, 249; from the practice of Primitive Church, 249, 250

Sacraments, Article xxv. Source and object of Article, 296; changes in form and language, 296, 297; origin of the word Sacramentum, its classical, ecclesiastical, and later usage, 297—299; sacraments defined in the Article (*a*) *negatively* and (*b*) *positively*, 299, 300; material things used by God as *signs* and *pledges*, 301; as supernatural means of Grace, 301, 302; Sacraments combine all these methods, as *testimonia*, *signa*, *pignora*, *media*, 302, 303; the five so-called Sacraments, 304; the fixing of the number seven, 304; why they are not of like nature with "the Sacraments of the Gospel," 304—306; the right use of the Sacraments, 306, 307
Sacrifice of Death of Christ, Article xxxi. Its efficacy, 359; the one perfect redemption, 360, 361; propitiation, 362, 363; satisfaction, 364; for the sins of the whole world, original and actual, 364, 365
Saints, Invocation of, Article xxii. *See* pp. 275—278
Salvation, Eternal, of obtaining, Article xviii. Title and language of Article, 229, 230; object of Article, 230; analysis, 230, 231; indirect proof of the position taken up in, 231, 232; direct proofs, 232—234; what the Article does and does not assert, 234
Scripture, Holy, sufficiency of for salvation, Article vi. Connection of Article, 97; history and language, 97, 98; object, 98; analysis, 98; the plenary authority of the Scriptures of the Old Testament accepted (1) by our Lord, 99; (2) by the Apostles, 99, 100; gradual growth of the New Testament, 101, 102; books of New Testament, 102; their authority recognised by the Apostles, 102, 103; relation of the Scriptures to tradition, 103, 104; teaching of the Fathers on this point, 104, 105; the Canonical Scriptures, 106; the Canon of the Old Testament, 107, 108; the Canon of the New Testament, 109, 110; early versions of the New Testament, the *Peshitto*, the *Vetus Itala*, 110, 111; the testimony of Eusebius, 111, 112; the Apocrypha, gradual formation of, 112; use of promoted by the Septuagint version, 112; and the Vulgate, 113; how far the English Church accepts, 113, 114
Sin after Baptism, Article xvi. Connection of Article, 200; variations of title, 200, 201; early errors respecting Post-Baptismal sin, 201; these errors reproduced by the Anabaptists, 201, 202; analysis of Article, 202; the remissibility of sin after Baptism deduced from (1) the teaching of our Lord, 203; (2) the Apostles, 204, 205; passages of Scripture urged against this view, (*a*) Matt. xii. 31, 32, 205, 206; (*b*) Heb. vi. 4—6, 206, 207; (*c*) Heb. x. 26, 27, 207; (*d*) Heb. xii. 16, 17, 208, 209
Sin, Christ alone without, Article xv. Need and object of Article, 189, 190; analysis, 190; proofs of our Lord's sinlessness from the Gospels, 191, 192; from the Epistles, 192, 193; His sinlessness qualifies Him to be "the Lamb without spot,"

193, 194; herein He differs from all the rest of mankind, 194; apparent exceptions, 194—198
Sin, Original, Article ix. Connection and origin of Article, 140, 141, object, 141; the teaching of Pelagius, 141; revived by the Anabaptists, 142; original sin, negative definition, 142; positive definition, 142, 143; the result of the Fall, 145, 146; effects as traced in the Old Testament, 147, 148; as taught by our Lord, 148; and by S. Paul, 148, 149; original sin and the doctrine of heredity, 149, 150; original sin as taught by the Early Fathers, 150, 151; taint of, remains even in the regenerate, 151; proof of this from S. Paul, S. Peter, and S. John, 152, 153; concupiscence, its relation to actual sin, 153, 154
Supererogation, works of, Article xiv. Connection of Article, 183; derivation of word "supererogation," 184; origin of doctrine, 184, 185; passages of Scripture supposed to support, 185—187; doctrine respecting laid down in the Article, 187; contradicted by our Lord's words, 187, 188
Supremacy, Royal, Article xxxvii. Definition of, 409; what it is not, what it is, 409, 410

Tongue, unknown, use of in services of the Church. Article xxiv. Object and wording of Article, 288; analysis of Article, 289; teaching of Holy Scripture in the Old and New Testament, 289, 290; custom of the Primitive Church, 291; testimony of the early Fathers, 291, 292; origin of use of the Latin tongue, 292, 293; custom of the Eastern Church, 293, 294
Traditions of the Church, Article xxxiv. Language of Article, 383; object, 383; meaning of word Traditions here, 383 *note*; the teaching of Scripture, 384; the teaching of Church history, 384—386; traditions not to be absolutely uniform, 386; nor to be wantonly broken or neglected, 386, 387; teaching of Scripture, 387; rights of national Churches, 388
Transubstantiation, Article xxviii. Derivation of word, 339 *note*; origin of doctrine, 337; teaching of the early Church, 337, 338; teaching of Paschasius Radbert, 338; teaching of Ratramnus, 338; controversy revived by Berengarius, 338, 339; the Scholastic Doctrine, 339; definition by Council of Trent, 340; objections of the Article to the doctrine, 340, 341; view sustained by the Article, 342, 343
Trinity, the, in Unity, Article i. First occurrence of the word Trinity in ecclesiastical writers, 38 *note*; intimations of a Trinity in the Old Testament, 39, 40; clearer revelation in the New, 40, 41; the Persons in the Trinity, 41; their respective characteristics, 42, 43

Unction, Extreme. *See* Extreme, pp. 305, 306
Unworthiness of Ministers, Article xxvi. Connection and object of Article, 308, 309; analysis, 310; teaching of our Lord respecting, 311; unworthiness of Ministers does not vitiate the Sacraments, 311, 312; side of warning of the Article, 312; need of ecclesiastical discipline, 312, 313; doctrine of Intention, 313, 314

War, right of States to declare, Article xxxvii. Object of Article, 421; right of war denied, 421; by whom and on what grounds, 422; objections answered, 422; righteous and unrighteous wars, 422 *n.*
Wicked, the, and the Lord's Supper, Article xxix. Connection of Article, 347; history of, 348; title, 348, 349; analysis, 349; phraseology, 349, 350; passages of Scripture examined, 350; words of S. Paul in 1 Cor. xi., 351; deduction from these words, 351
Will, Free, Article xi. *See under* Free Will, pp. 155—159

Works before Justification, Article xiii. Connection and Title of Article, 178; object, 179; analysis, 179, 180; doctrine repudiated by the Article, 179; Scripture teaching respecting the subject, 180; with whom the Article deals, 181, 182; with whom it does not deal, 182

Works, Good, Article xii. Connection of Article, 171; history and object, 172; analysis, 172; our Lord's teaching as regards good works, 172, 173; connection of good works with justification, 175; good works imperfect, 175; but not therefore to be deprecated, 175, 176; teaching of S. Paul and S. James respecting good works, 176, 177

V.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS EXPLAINED IN THE NOTES.

ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, 124
ἀγανακτεῖν, 325, 326
ἀγεννησία, 88
ἀληθινός, 34
ἁμαρτία, 145
ἁμαρτίαν ἔχειν, 153
ἄμεμπτος, 195
ἀναζωπυρεῖν, 305
ἀνάμνησις, 332 *n.*
ἄνωθεν 321
ἀπεβλέπειν, 126
ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, 64
ἀποκαταλλάσσειν, 57
ἀπόκρυφος, 112
ἀπόστολος, 284
ἀταραξία, 224

βάσανοι, 267

γέννησις, 88
γραφή, 100

δικαίωσις, 164
δόκιμος, 225

ἐκκλησία, 237
ἑκουσίως, 207
ἐκπορεύεσθαι, 89
ἑλκύειν 158
ἐναγκαλέσασθαι, 326
ἐπιγινώσκειν, 48
ἐπίγνωσις, 207
ἐπιθυμία, 153
ἑρευνᾶν, 117
ἐξομολόγησις, 319

θέαμα, 82
θειοτής, 48
θεότης, 48
θρησκεία, 277

ἰδιώτης, 290
ἱλασμός, 362
ἱλαστήριον, 362 *n.*

καλεῖν, 223
καταλλαγή, 56
κατεργάζειν, 160
κατέχειν, 57
κατήχειν, 290
κηρύσσειν, 63
κύλιξ, 353

λῆρος, 77
λόγια, 252
λογίζεσθαι, 167
λύγχη, 55
λύτρον, 361 *n.*
λυτρωτής, 361 *n.*
λύτρωσις, 361 *n.*

μετανοίας τόπος, 202
μορφή, 48
μυστήριον, 298

ὁμιλία, 391
ὁμοούσιος, 49
ὀνειδισμός, 126

παιδαγωγός, 118
παλιγγενεσία, 323

παράδεισος, 62
παραπεσεῖν, 206
παρεπίδημος, 125
πατρίς, 125
περιελεῖν, 365 *n.*
περιποίησις, 221
πιστός, 194
ποιῶ, 152
πόλις, 126
πράσσω, 152
προγινώσκω, 222
προορίζειν, 222

στέλλεσθαι, 387

συνεκλεκτή, 415
σύρειν, 158
σχῆμα, 48 *n.*

ὑπόστασις, 39

φθανεῖν, 232
φυλακή, 63
φωτισμός, 206

χειροτονεῖν, 313
χρηστότης, 37
χωρίς, 159

VI.

INDEX OF LATIN WORDS EXPLAINED IN THE NOTES.

æternus, 34
anathematizandi, 230

bonitas, 37

calix, 353
certus, 300
confictus, 264
congruus, 179
conservator, 38
consuetudo, 383
curiosus, 224

depravatio, 143

efficax, 300
erogare, 184
evertere, 341

fidelis, 239
futilis, 263

generaliter, 225
gratia, 157
gratia efficax, 176
gratia sufficiens, 176

homilia, 391

immensus, 35
immolatio, 190
impartibilis, 34
impassibilis, 35
incorporeus, 34
indulgentia, 269
inniti, 264
inserere, 317
instrumentum, 316
integritas, 79

justificatio, 163

massa, 215
missæ, 366

peccatum a traduce, 141
per fidem, 163
persona, 39
præcipitium, 224
prædicare, 231
pravus, 142
principaliter, 90
propitiatio, 362
propter fidem, 163

quam longissime, 143

ratio peccati, 154
redemptio, 360
regeneratio, 323
resipiscere, 202
res sacramenti, 335, 337

Romanenses, 263

sacramentum, 297, 298
satisfactio, 363
secta, 231
securitas, 224
supererogatio, 184
supplicium, 55

unus, 40

verus, 34
virtus Sacramenti, 350
vivus, 33

VII.

INDEX OF ENGLISH WORDS EXPLAINED.

accidents, 339
anywise, 317
Apocrypha, 112

Church, 239
congruous, 179
consubstantial, 49

eternal, 34

fond, 263

general, 225 *n.*, 226
generally, 225 *n.*
goodness, 36

hell, 62
homily, 391

in anywise, 317

lively, 172
living, 33

œcumenical, 257

Paradise, 62
porrection, 400
preserver, 38
propitiation, 362

real, 343
rechelesnesse, 224
redemption, 360
regeneration, 323

satisfaction, 363
set out, 231
Sheol, 62
substance, 339 *n.*

Trinity, 38
transubstantiation, 339
true, 34

without body, 34
without parts, 34
without passions, 35

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. & C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

THE EXTENT OF THE REVOLT FROM ROME

Maclear's Thirty-nine Articles.

London: Macmillan & Co. Limited.

UNIVERSITIES OF EUROPE IN THE XVI CENTURY.

Maclear's Thirty-nine Articles

London: Macmillan & Co. Limited.

London: Stanford's Geog.l Estab.t

DATE DUE

TRINITY COLLEGE LIBRARY
978-5851

NOV 09 2004